

JOURNAL
OF THE
PALI TEXT SOCIETY

VOLUME XXIII

EDITED BY
O. VON HINÜBER
AND
R. F. GOMBRICH

Published by
THE PALI TEXT SOCIETY
OXFORD

1997

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means analogue, digital, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise stored in any retrieval system of any nature without the written permission of The Pali Text Society Limited of 73 Lime Walk, Headington, Oxford OX3 7AD.

© *Pali Text Society* 1997

ISBN 0 86013 356 7

First published in 1997
Distributed by Lavis Marketing
73 Lime Walk
Oxford OX3 7AD

Printed in Great Britain by
Antony Rowe Ltd, Chippenham, Wiltshire

CONTENTS

Pali, Pāṇini and “Popular” Sanskrit By Thomas Oberlies	1
The Paramatthajotikādīpanī, a Fragment of the Sub- commentary to the Paramatthajotikā II on the Suttanipāta By Oskar von Hinüber	27
Buddhist Literature of Lān Nā on the History of Lān Nā’s Buddhism By Hans Penth	43
On the School-affiliation of the “Patna <i>Dhammapada</i> ” By Peter Skilling	83
New Pāli Inscriptions from South-east Asia By Peter Skilling	123
Sāriputta and his works By Primoz Pecenko	159
An Index to JPTS Volumes IX–XXII	181
Contributors to this Volume	189
Notices	191

Pali, Pāṇini and “Popular” Sanskrit*

(Miscellanea Palica VI)

Though it has never been doubted that non-standard Sanskrit (or *sanskrit approximatif*, as Helmer Smith [1954: 3] called it) as evidenced by the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Purāṇas is of prime importance for the study of the history of Pali and other Middle Indo-Aryan languages, the Pali grammar of Geiger – and the same holds true for the Prakrit grammar of Pischel – does not make any reference to Epic or Purāṇic Sanskrit forms. Just as little attention has been paid to the relation of Pali (and Middle Indo-Aryan in general) to late Vedic and Sanskrit as described by Pāṇini. On the other hand, scholars discussing specific forms and constructions of late Vedic, of Epic and Purāṇic Sanskrit and of Pāṇini's grammar have rarely taken into account corresponding Middle Indian phenomena. A few selected examples – in the main syntactical and lexical problems – will be discussed to show that the interlinking of the linguistic study of Pali, of Epic and Purāṇic Sanskrit and of Pāṇini will not only help us to achieve a better understanding of the development of the Indo-Aryan languages, but will also prove fruitful for the better comprehending of what the texts actually tell us.

* The author wishes to express his gratitude to the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* for granting a *Heisenberg-Stipendium*. This enabled him to write this paper, which is the outcome of an extensive investigation of Epic Sanskrit, the results of which will be published as a “Grammar of Epic Sanskrit” (in *Indian Philology and South Asian Studies* [ed. by A. Wezler and M. Witzel]). My thanks are also due to Professor O. von Hinüber, who read an earlier version of this paper and made valuable suggestions. Needless to say, I am responsible for any faults this article may contain.

I use the abbreviations of the titles of Pali texts laid down in the *Epilogomena* to Volume I of *A Critical Pali Dictionary*.

1.1. *Instrumental in place of locative*

One syntactical feature shared by Pali, Prakrit and non-standard Sanskrit is the usage of the instrumental¹ in place of the locative². It will be seen that the consideration of the same phenomenon in Epic Sanskrit on the one hand, and in Prakrit on the other, will help us to assess one of Lüders' hypotheses relating to the "eastern" proto-canonical Buddhist language. Lüders postulated a locative in *°ehi* for the "eastern" language, since a couple of Pali stanzas use a form in *°ehi* where we would expect a locative (1954: § 220-225; cf. von Hinüber § 321)³. But it is well known that, in the syntax of Epic Sanskrit, the salient feature is the interchangeability of different cases in construction with verb forms. This "confusion" of cases was due to the incipient break-down of the inflectional system, which again led to the employment of a large number of post-positions. The same phenomenon is encountered in Middle Indo-Aryan where – e.g. in the feminine noun inflection (cf. Insler 1994: 70) –

¹ I regret that I do not have access to Sukumar Sen, "The use of the instrumental in Middle Indo-Aryan", PAIOC V (Summaries) 44-48 (according to the PAIOC index it has been published in *Indian Linguistics* 8 – however, it is not to be found there).

² Due to my regrettable ignorance of any Dravidian language I do not know whether (or not) and (if so) to what extent such a phenomenon is due to the influence of Dravidian. To judge from the investigations of De Vreeze (1953, 1980), "Dravidisms" in Pali only appear rather late.

³ In the report on his investigations into the Buddhist "Urkanon", originally published in SBAW 1927, p. 123, and reprinted in Lüders 1954: 8, Lüders explicitly speaks of the "Lok. pl. auf -ehi" (cf. also von Hinüber 1968: § 307). And he considers this form as a *peculiarity of the nominal inflexion* of the "Ostsprache" and *not* of the syntax of that language: "Auch in der Flexion zeigen sich manche Unterschiede. Wichtig ist besonders, daß der Akk. Pl. der *a*-Stämme auf -am ausging, der Lok. pl. auf -ehi" (l.c.). Lüders' reasoning, in establishing this ending, is as simple as it is in the case of the "ablative" in *°am* (cf. de Vreeze 1955: 370): some verbs are normally construed with the locative; if we find a form in *°ehi* in one of these constructions it has to be a locative; and because we do find it we have a locative in *°ehi*.

the paradigms were reduced to an opposition between *casus rectus* (nom. and acc.) and *casus obliquus*. Thus, in all kinds of non-standard Sanskrit, the instrumental can be used where we would normally expect the locative:

cito 'gnir udvahan yajñam paksābhyañ tān prabādhate "The piled-up fire that carries up the sacrifice frustrates them on both sides", Mbh 3.210.17⁴

makarasya tu tunđe vai karṇo rājan vyavasthitah / netrābhyañ śakuniḥ śūra ulūkaś ca mahārathah "O king! Karṇa is standing in the mouth of [the army, which is arrayed in the form of a] makara, while the heroic Śakuni and Ulūka, the great warrior, are placed in its eyes", Mbh 8,7.15 (v.l. *netrayoh* [cf. critical notes ad loc.])

dvihi kulehi ... bodhisattvā jāyanti, kṣatriyakule brāhmaṇakule vā "The Bodhisattvas are born in two kinds of families, either in the family of a Kṣatriya or in the family of a Brāhmaṇa", Mvu I,197.12⁵

... *śūlena protah* "He was impaled on a stake", Prabhācandra's Ārādhanākathāprabandha 45,10⁶, corresponding to *śūle protah*, Nemidatta's Ārādhanākathākośa 23.9, and to *śūlikāyām niveśitah*, Hariṣena's Brhatkathākośa 62.12 (cf. *śūle protah purāṇarśir acoraś coraśāṅkayā*, Mbh 1,57.77, *śūle protah*, 1,101.11)

There may be a slight semantic difference between the *instrumentalis (loci)* and the locative proper (cf. Wijesekera 1993:

⁴ Most probably it is this stanza that Sen had in mind when he maintained that *paksābhyañ* is used in the Mahābhārata for the locative (1958: 25) – but unfortunately without giving a reference.

⁵ Cf. BHSG 7.32, where further examples are cited (cf. § 7.30-31 and 7.34).

⁶ Cf. Upadhye 1974: 21.

§ 166e), but on the whole both cases are interchangeable⁷, as the *variae lectiones* show⁸. Thus the locative and the instrumental can be used in coordination: *dvau putrau vinatā vavre kadriūputrādhikau bale / ojasā tejasā caiva vikramenādhikau sutau* “Vinatā chose two sons who were to exceed Kadrū's sons in strength and to excel them in brilliance, beauty, and might”, Mbh 1,14.8⁹.

In this respect, the fact that the Epic poets partly used the instrumental and partly the locative to convey what is evidently the same meaning is very instructive. Compare e.g. a) *durmantritena* vs. *durmantrite* b) *durnayah* vs. *durnaye* c) *prayojanam* + instr. vs. + loc.¹⁰:

⁷ Usually the locative is used to denote the asterism “at (/ under) which” something takes place, but occasionally the instrumental is, as already stated by Pān 2.3.45 (cf. Speijer 1886: § 78 rem. 2; Hopkins [1903: 5] remarks that “the instrumental is regularly used with the words *pusya-* and *tisya-*”). Thus we come across sentences like *mārgaśīrṣyām atītāyām pusyena prayayus tataḥ*, Mbh 3,91.25, *pusyena samprayātō 'smi śravaṇe punar āgataḥ*, Mbh 9,33.5 or *kṛṣibhāgi bhaven martyaḥ kurvañ śrāddham punarvasau / puṣṭikāmo 'tha pusyena śrāddham iñeta mānavāḥ*, Mbh 13,89.4.

⁸ Cf. *utsaṅgena vyāla ivāhrto 'si* “You are like a snake which we took with (= into) our lap”, Mbh 2,57.3 (v.l. *utsaṅge nu / ca*, *sa tad ājñāya duṣṭātmā pitur vacanam apriyam / nirāśaḥ sarvakalyāñaiḥ śocan paryapatan mahīm* “Hearing these unfriendly words of his father the wicked [Aśvatthāman], despairing of obtaining every kind of prosperity, began in grief to wander over the earth”, Mbh 10,12.10 (v.l. *okable* [cf. critical notes ad loc.]). The word *nirāśa-* is frequently construed with the locative (*nirāśāni svajivite*, Mbh 4,58.13, *nirāśa jīvite 'bhavan*, 5,48.47, *tau nirāśau madarthe*, Rāmāyaṇa 5,35.61), but also with other cases (cf. PW s.v. [where, however, no example for the instrumental is given]).

⁹ Most probably Pisani (1946: 188) is wrong to contend that *tasmin* is related to *panitena* in the sentence *tataḥ sā vinatā tasmin panitena parañjita* “Then Vinatā was defeated in that bet”, Mbh 1,20.3. It must be construed with *panitena*: “... was defeated in the bet on that [horse]”.

¹⁰ The cases multiply when we go into the manuscripts, as can be seen from Kulkarni's investigation of the case variations in the critical edition of the Mahābhārata (1946: 83, 96, 103-104, 114-115, 134, 149, 172, 187, 200, 215).

(a)

- *sa śete niṣṭanan bhūmau vātarugna iva drumaḥ / mama durmantritenāśau yathā nārhaḥ sa bhārata,* Mbh 6,15.15
- *bhīmo bhīma balo rājaṁ / tava durmantritenā ha,* Mbh 7,90.24
- *saṃsmṛtya sarvaduhkhāni / tava durmantritenā ca,* Mbh 7,162.52
- *ksatriyā nidhanam yānti / karṇa durmantritenā ca,* Mbh 6,92.7

(a)

- *sa śete niṣṭanan bhūmau vātarugna iva drumaḥ / tava durmantrite rājan yathā nārhaḥ sa bhārata,* Mbh 6,14.13
- *tava durmantrite rājan / sa putrasya viśāṁ pate,* Mbh 7,107.31
- *tava durmantrite rājan / sahaputrasya bhārata,* Mbh 9,16.85
- *rājan durmantrite tava,* Mbh 6,58.19 = 7,80.31 = 122.88 = 127.26 = 157.12 = 8,40.6 = 40.129 = 9,15.37 = 22.41 = 22.71

(b)

- *vinaśṭān kauravān manye / mama putrasya durnayaiḥ,* Mbh 7,108.7

(b)

- *avyūhatārjuno vyūham / putrasya tava durnaye,* Mbh 8,32.3 (cf. [ambike] *tava putrasya / durnayāt kila bhāratāḥ*, Mbh 1,119.9)

(c)

- *bheṣajaiḥ kiṁ prayojanam,* Mbh 12,137.52

(c)

- *papracchāgamane hetum aṭane ca prayojanam,* Mbh 3,89.3
- *na me prayojanam kiṁcid gamane pannagāśana,* Mbh 5,110.15

- *na hi me vidyate sūta jīvite
'dya prayojanam*, Mbh 6-73.26
- *gārhaspatye kim prayojanam*, Mbh 12.261.4
- *vacane kim prayojanam*, Mbh 12.308.127
- (cf. *yadā jīvitena
prayojanam*, Pañcatantra 162,6, 256,12 [PW s.v.])
- *jīvite ca prayojanam*, Mbh 13,54.39
- *jīvite 'sti prayojanam*, R (Bomb.) 4,1.31
- *gamane kim prayojanam*, R (Bomb.) 5,60.6

(d)

- (cf. *na ca me ... jīvitena
krtyam*, Mṛcchakaṭīka 154,3)
- *bhoḥ kim āgamane krtyam*
“What is the use of coming”, Mbh 13,41.14

As far as (d) *āgamane* is concerned, the sequence *°ane<na>* (preceded by another nasal!) may have led to the loss of the syllable *na* by haplology (cf. AiGr. III § 32bα)¹¹. This haplological loss may account for the cases where a locative and an instrumental are coordinated:

¹¹ The same holds true for *anaśane<na>* in the sentence *deham vānaśane tyaktvā
sa svargam samupāśnute* “Having died by fasting he reaches heaven”, Mbh 13,130.47 – unless we are to translate “having died in fasting”. This feature is to be found in Pali too: (*gāmehi nigamehi vā*) *raṭṭhe<hi>* (*janapadehi vā*), Ja VI 294,27*, *vasanehi anūpame<hi>*, Thī 374 (cf. Bechert 1955: 13 n. 25). This explanation (on which cf. Norman, transl. p. 138) is certainly to be preferred to Pischel's: “*anūpame* is instr. plur.” (Thī-ed. p. 209). Cf. *mamam̄ rodantiyā
sati<yā>*, Ja VI 188,2* (*rodamānāyā satiyā*, ct.).

sudhanvan vipane<na> tena praśnam prcchāva ye viduh “With that stake we shall ask the question of those who know”, Mbh 5,35.13, *sainyena rajasāvṛte<na>* “by the dust of the army which covered [everything]”, Mbh 9,16.77 = 20.31 = 22.48 = 28.12, *sainyena rajasā dhvaste<na> (nirmaryādam avarata)* “by the dust of the army which was scattered [all around]”, Mbh 7,73.53 (cf. *sainye ca rajasā dhvaste nirmaryādam avarata, 7,31.33*)

In some cases, however, we only find the locative used where we would expect the instrumental: *vāsudevasyānumate* “With the consent of Vāsudeva”, Mbh 1,2.92. And *anumate* is much too frequent¹² to be explained by such a “sporadic” phenomenon as syllabic haplology (even if we take it as a generalized form). It may represent an (abbreviated) *locativus absolutus*: *anumate (sati)* “when there is consent”, which exactly amounts to “with the consent (of)”. And it is this feature – (abbreviated) *locativus absolutus* = instrumental – which may have contributed to the further merging of both cases. Consequently we not only encounter the *locativus absolutus* but also an *instrumentalis absolutus* (cf. BHSG § 7.34, Upadhye 1943: 100):

kṛṣṇena samupetena jahrṣe bhārataṁ puram “When Kṛṣṇa arrived, the city of the Bhāratas burst out shouting with joy”, Mbh 2,30.15 (cf. *anyaiḥ samṛddhair apy arthair na sutād vidyate param* “For surely, a son prevails, and nothing prevails

¹² *anumate* “with the consent of” is attested in the following places of the epics: Mbh 1,54.11, 77.2, 96.4, 99.17, 108.18, 124.3, 150.3, 196.11, 199.50, 3.7.17, 117.13, 161.14, 267.13, 281.79, 5,31.16, 32.6, 47.2, 171.4, 7,66.2, 102.81, 102.83, 152.11, 9,16.10, 31.29, 12,5.7, 31.41, 274.15, 274.20, 321.13, 13,34.27, 14,26.13, 51.53, 15,13.7, 13.8, 13.16, 25.13, R 1,61.23, 66.24, 67.6, 2,38.7, 69.14.

over a son”, Mbh 3,10.5, *punyāhaghoṣair vimalair vedānām ninadais tathā / deveṣu caiva vyagreṣu tasmin yajñavidhau tadā*, Mbh 9,37.6 [v.l. G M °ghoṣe vipule ... ninade (cf. crit. notes ad loc.)]).

Since no one will maintain that any of all these forms in *-ena* or *-aih / -ebhih* is any case other than an instrumental, I do not see why *dantehi* in the following sentences should be considered as a locative (as is done by von Hinüber § 321, and id. 1968: § 307)¹³: *ajinamhi haññate dīpī nāgo dantehi haññati* “The leopard is killed for his skin, the elephant for his tusks”, Ja VI 78,17* (*ajinamhi haññate dīpī / nāgo dantehi haññati / dhanamhi dhanino hanti aniketam asanthavam*, Ja VI 61,4*)¹⁴.

Turning to the Prakrits, we meet with the same phenomenon of the – at least partial – interchangeability of instrumental and locative¹⁵: *eehi munī sayanēhim samāna āsi patelasa vāse* “The sage [and] monk dwelt for thirteen years in those resting-places” (Āyāraṅgasutta 1.9.2.4), *Lādhehi tassa uvasaggā bahave* “He had many difficulties in Lādha” (l. c. 1.9.3.3). It is a characteristic feature of the language of Vimalasūri’s

¹³ We can single out at least one of Lüders' in any case rather few examples: *kāmesu ve haññare bajjhare ca / kāmesu dukkham ca bhayam ca jātam / kāmesu bhūtādhipatī pamattā / pāpāni kammāni karonti mohā*, Ja IV 312,27*-30* (~ Jāt-m 114,17*-20*). Here Lüders' explanation of *kāmesu* is certainly wrong. The poet started the stanza with *kāmesu*, a *nimitta-saptamī* – as the Indian grammarians call it –, and as he obviously wished to repeat *kāmesu* for the sake of emphasis, he used in pāda b and c the (shortened) *locativus absolutus kāmesu (santesu)* “when (there are) desires”.

¹⁴ As is well known (Kielhorn 1898: 18-19 [= Kl. Sch. p. 295-296]) a quite similar stanza is found in Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya: *carmanī dvīpinam hanti dantayor hanti kuñjaram* (I 458,18).

¹⁵ Cf. Ghatage 1937 and 1941: § 372, Upadhye 1944: 53; cf. also Paumacariya, Vol. I (Prakrit Text Society 6, Varanasi 1962), p. 33.

Paumacariya: *ambaratalena vaccai*, 8.42¹⁶. But it is here that "the locative is regularly used for the instrumental" (Ghatage 1937: 56, cf. id. 1953: 116): *nāñāviha-pāyavesu sañchannā* "covered with trees of various sorts" (Paumacariya 17.29 [reading of J, the oldest ms. available¹⁷]), *karemi mahilāsu saha neham* "I make love with the women" (ibid. 108.39). This merging of instrumental and locative was completed in Apabhramṣa, as is well known: "Der Verwendungsbereich des loc. ist [im Apabhramṣa] gegenüber dem Pkt. stark erweitert. ... Der loc. tritt häufig ein für den instr. Die Verwechslung geht nach Jacobi (San. § 14) vom plur. aus, wo beide Kasus schon früh lautlich und begrifflich zusammengefallen sind. So dient der loc. auch im sing. gleichzeitig als instr. bei den femininen A- und I-Stämmen. Für die Verwendung des loc. sing. der masc. und neutr. A-Stämme als instr. bietet Bh[avisatta Kaha] (S. 34* Anm. 1) 27, San[atkumāracaritam] (§ 14) 3 Belege. Im Kum[ārapālapratibodha] finden wir 15 instr. auf -i" (Alsdorf 1928: 64; cf. Singh 1980: 52, Bhayani 1953: 63).

Taking into account all these facts I see no reason why the Pali phenomenon should be treated quite differently. Here, too, it is a matter of *syntax* and *not of morphology*. A sentence like ... *titthehi ... assaṁ pāyehi*, Ja I 185,3*, has its counterpart in *bhuñjate rukmapātribhīh* "They eat on (/from) golden plates", Mbh 2,45.18 (cf. Meenakshi 1983: 72).

1.2. Pali/Prakrit and Epic-Purānic Sanskrit

Popular Sanskrit, as evidenced by both Epics and the Purāṇas, and Middle Indo-Aryan also share a number of grammatical and lexical features. Some of them are very frequently attested both in the Epics and

¹⁶ Cf. Jacobi 1918: 60*, Upadhye 1944: 153.

¹⁷ See Paumacariya, vol. II, p. XVI.

Purāṇas and in the Theravāda canon: the gen. pl. in (Skt.) °*īnām* and °*ūnām* resp. (P.) °*īnam* and °*ūnam* (cf. Geiger § 83.8¹⁸), the same form to denote the nom. and the acc. pl. in the feminine *i*-declension(s), in the *r*-declension (of words signifying personal relations) and in the *n*-declension, the acc. pl. (Skt.) *gāvah* resp. (P.) *gāvo* (cf. Geiger § 88.3), the generalization of the weak stem (Skt.) *viduṣ-* resp. (P.) *vidū-* (cf. Geiger § 100.2), the transfer of stems from one declension to another one (leading to the merging of [masc.] *i*- and *in*-declensions and of feminine *i*- and *ī*-declensions and to the emergence of new words like *apsarā-* / *accharā-* [etc.]), the genitives (Skt.) *mahyam* and *tubhyam* resp. (P.) *mayham* and *tuyham* (etc.). Some of them, however, are only sporadically encountered, such as:

- certain normalizations within the pronominal inflexion: loc. sg. fem. (Skt.) *paścimasyām* (cf. R 1,60.3 v.l., 4,36.3, Hariv. 93,15¹⁹), analogical to other pronouns denoting cardinal points (cf. AiGr. III § 268f); vice versa, (P.) *uttarāya[m]*²⁰ (beside *uttarassām disāyam*, SN I 148,4*/6* [Geiger § 113.8; cf. AiGr. III § 267aα]).
- *viṁśat-* instead of °*viṁśati-* and °*trīṁśati-* instead of *trīṁśat-*²¹.
- ordinal number instead of cardinal number: (Skt.) *ekavīṁśaś ca daśa ca*, Mbh 12,308.112, *caturviṁśām putraśataṁ babhūva*,

¹⁸ There are more examples: *pāṇinām*, Th 1258, *sivinām*, Ja IV 405,24* (C^k *sivinām* [faulty metre]), *abandhunām*, Th 240, Ap 323,22 (cf. CPD s.v. *abandhu*).

¹⁹ Cf. Br̥hatkathākośa 71.1, 99.53 (Upadhye 1943: 97).

²⁰ Cf. CPD s.v. *uttara* (DN I 153,19, Ap 541,5, Ja V 43,11' [commenting on *uttariyām disāyam*, 42,21*]). Cf. JM. *uttarāyām disāyam*, Vasudevahinī 280.27 (cf. 310.22 and 323.18).

²¹ Pali *vīsa(m)-* (Sn 1019, It 99, Ja V 36,22), Skt. (°) *viṁśat-* (Mbh 1,2.199 v.l., 1,180*, R 6,55.7; in compounds: *viṁśadbhuja-*, R 3,30.8, 3,33.9 v.l., *viṁśadbāhu-*, R 7,32.49, *viṁśadyojana-*, R 5,1.145), Pali (*chat*) *tim̥sati-* (Dhp 339), Skt. *trīṁśati-* (Mbh 6,57.12, 12,103.20, R 6,55.7 v.l., 6,96.14 v.l.).

Mbh 1,90.39, *viṁśabhuja-*, R 7,9.22 v.l., (P.) *pañcamehi bandhanehi*, SN IV 201,22, 202,9 (Geiger § 118.4).

- the accusative of the enclitic form of the pronouns in place of the nominative / vocative²².
- the usage of *asmi* in the sense of *aham*²³.
- misplaced *iti* in direct speech (cf. Pisani 1934: 74-75)²⁴

²² (P.) nom. *vo*, Ja VI 576,29*, Mil 19.4, Mhv I 14,3 (cf. Oberlies 1995: 143; for BHS cf. BHSG § 20.44, for JM. Alsdorf 1935/37: 331 = Kl. Sch. p. 68 [*jenam vo samanenam mahājanamajhe ohāmiyā tam pacchannam jīviyāo vavaroveha*, Vasudevahīṇḍi 88.21]), voc. *vo*, Vin I 23,21/25, nom. *no*, Ja VI 578,20* (cf. CPD I/531 [sub (δ)], Bechert 1958: 312; for BHS cf. BHSG § 20.39), (Skt.) *etām buddhim samāsthāya karṣitau vām mayā ksudhā* “Having come to that decision both of you grew lean by me, hunger”, Mbh 13,55.19 (cf. AiGr. III § 236bβ rem.).

²³ This usage is rather often encountered in the Prakrits (cf. Pischel §417, Alsdorf 1935/37: 326-327 [= Kl. Sch. pp. 63-64], Upadhye 1944: 52 [where Dhūrtākhyāna II.2, IV.2/4 is concerned]). It seems to be very rare in Pali: *samhaṭṭhalomo avacasmī bhīto* (for *avac<am> asmi*), “I said”, Ja V 165,27* (cf. Wackernagel, Kl. Sch. p. 162), *saṁviggo 'mhi tadā āśīm*, Ap 195,7 (CPD I/529, col. a, ll. 33-35; cf. Bechert 1958: 312). The same holds true for Epic Sanskrit: *eso 'smi hanmi samkalpam* “I frustrate your plans”, Mbh 8,12.34 v.l. (CE *eso 'sya hanmi*). In Purāṇic Sanskrit, however, it becomes much more frequent (I take the examples from Pathak 1969: 126): *vicarāmy asmi*, Skandapurāṇa II 5.21, *asmī vasāmi*, Skandapurāṇa II 32.165 (cf. *pibasy asi*, Skandapurāṇa II 40.88 [cf. Vāmana 5,2.82 (PW VII/1705)]). And we know this usage also from works written in “Classical” Sanskrit: *avocam asmi*, Buddhacarita 1.67, *nrmāṇsam asmi vikriṇe*, Kathāsaritsāgara 25.187, Bodhicaryāvatāra 3.7, cf. Mallinātha ad Kirātārjuniya 3.6: *asmīty aham-arthe 'vyayam* (cf. PW I/536 n. *).

²⁴ (P.) *Bhāradvājo +ti bhāsati*, Sn 596; (Skt.) *abравīd iti mām bhīṣma vacanam prītivardhanam / aham priyatamah putraḥ*, Mbh 1,122.28, *praviṣya tad veṣma mahārathānām* ity *abравīd draupadīm rājaputrīm*, Mbh 2,60.19, ity *evam ārtah paridevayan saḥ / rājā kurūnāṇi nakulaṇi babhāṣe*, Mbh 10,10.26, *tīrthayātrā sāmudre vaḥ kāryeti puruṣarṣabhaḥ*, Mbh 16,3.22, *sa putram ekaṇi rājyāya pālayeti niyujya ca / prthivīm kṣatradharmena vanam evānvapadyata*, R 1,54.11 (cf. Speijer 1886: § 495), *śuśrāva ca vacas teṣām ... hatāḥ sma khalu ye neha*

- the use of the masculine participle in construction with a feminine noun: *obhāsayam̄ vanam̄ rammaṇam̄ ... kā vā tvam̄ asi kalyāṇi*, Ja V 89,24*, ... *sā khujjā ... evam̄ dubbhāsitaṇam̄ bhaṇam̄*, Ja V 299,2* (cf. Oberlies 1995: 109 s.v. *anibbisam̄*); *vārṣneyam̄ tu tato bhaimī sāntvayañ ślakṣṇayā girā*, Mbh 3,57.11 (cf. ... *tato rājā sāntvayañ ślakṣṇayā girā*, 1,92.30, *tathā ṛṣir uvācainaṇam̄ sāntvayañ ślakṣṇayā girā*, 1,166.5), *nirīkṣamāṇā ... munivaco smaran*, Mbh 3,280.32, *sā drṣṭvā kṛṣṇam̄ āyāntam̄ ... pr̄thāpārthāṇ anusmaran*, Mbh 5,88.2.

The peculiarities of the verbal system common to Pali and non-standard Sanskrit are even more striking. Let me cite just one example, namely the “wrong” and “misplaced” addition of the augment: (P.) *pacc-a-niyyāhi*, DN II 22,16, *a-paribrūhayi*, Ja V 361,16* (cf. CPD s.v. ^{2a}, Rem. a/b), (BHS) *adhy-a-bhāṣati abhy-a-siñcet, upāsaṇkrāmat* (cf. BHSG § 32.5, 8, 12), (Skt.) *pary-a-rundhīta*, R 4,1143* (~ *pratyarautsīt*, 4,1144*), (imp.) *abhy-a-bhāṣa*, R 4,3.25, (part.) *vy-a-caran*, R 3,37.3/4, *vy-a-dipayan*, R 2,5.24, *abhy-a-vahan*, R 4,11*, *a-sambhramat*, Mbh 6,78.38, 7,75.5, *praty-a-vyūhan*, Mbh 3,269.6, *praty-a-samharam*, R 5,56.55.

A close comparison of these languages sheds light on linguistic phenomena of Middle Indo-Aryan ill-judged in our grammars (cf. 1.2.1.). And it even may help to solve some of the enigmas of Indo-Aryan philology which have long troubled scholars (cf. 1.2.2.). I shall briefly discuss two examples to illustrate these points.

paśyāma iti rāghavam, R 2,51.10, *ity uvāca vacaḥ krūram didhakṣann iva tejasā / kiṁ tavāpakṛtam rājan vane nivasatā mayā*, R 2,57.29.

1.2.1. Syncopation

It is only in the “latest additions” of the pW (p. 315 s.v. *astra*) that the two “Petersburger Wörterbücher” give for *iṣvastra-* the meaning “the science of arms” (with reference to Mbh 1,123.13.43)²⁵. But also at Mbh 5,178.16 (*iṣvastram mama bālasya bhavataiva caturvidham / upadiṣṭam ...*) and 9,5.14 (*daśāṅgam yaś catuśpādam iṣvastram veda tattvataḥ*) this word clearly has this meaning – as it has at Divyāvadāna 528.6. Obviously, Pischel (as also Chatterji 1983: 63) was not aware of this meaning of *iṣvastra-* when he derived the Prakrit word *īsattha-* from Skt. *īsuśāstra-* (§ 148). In order to overcome the phonetic difficulties he had to postulate the loss of the vowel *-u-*: *īsattha-* ← **is[u]sattha-*. According to Pischel, about ten words show this complete loss of a vowel. But, as with *īsattha-*, some of them also have to be explained differently: α) *uppiṁ*²⁶ ← *upari x uttara[m]*; β) *khu / hu*²⁷ ← *kho* ← *khadu*²⁸; γ) *majjhanna-*²⁹ ← (by *dh*—*h*-dissimilation) *madhyāhna-* (Wackernagel, Kl. Sch. p. 1879-1880; AiGr. I § 108 n.); δ) *suṇhā- / soṇhā-*³⁰ ← **ṇhusā-* ← *snuṣā-* (Jacobi 1886: XXXII n. 3). So we are left only with *subbhi-* (← *surabhi-*) and (the analogically formed) *dubbhi-* and, interestingly enough, with some kinship terms: *dhīyā-* (← nom. sg. *duhitā* [already dissyllabic in late Vedic: Lüders, Phil. Ind. p. 506]), *piusiyā-, bhāujjā-, māussiā-* (etc.). But we know that kinship terms are, being terms of address, subject to irregular shortening. So there is only one single example for the phenomenon of “vowel loss”. Could *subbhi-*

²⁵ Neither Monier-Williams nor Apte gives this meaning.

²⁶ Pischel derived this word from *up_ari*.

²⁷ For the derivation of this word see below.

²⁸ Such particles often show peculiar phonetics (cf. Jacobi 1886: LXXII).

²⁹ Pischel derived it from *madhyam_dna-*.

³⁰ Pischel derived these words from *sun_uhā-*, the ‘*h*-variant’ of *sunusā-* which is a continuation of *snuṣā-*.

and *dubbhi-* be words of the women's language and do they as such have a more popular form?

If we take a closer look at the paragraph of Geiger's grammar dealing with vowel syncopation (§ 20), some of its examples likewise disappear: *jaggati* is not "to be traced from *jāgarati* through **jāg[~]rati*", but has developed out of (Epic) Sanskrit (3. sg.) *jāgrati*³¹, based on the present stem *jāgra^o* which was extracted from (3. pl.) *jāgrati*; *kho* does not result from *khalu* by syncopation of *a*, but is due to the loss of the intervocalic *l* and the subsequent contraction of *a-u* to *o* (cf. Pisani 1952: 281); and ^o*mhe* (besides ^o*mahe*) is based on a form *-*āme* (= x : -*āma* = -*ate* : -*ati* = -*ase* : -*asi* = -*ante* : -*anti*) into which the *h* of -*ahve* has been introduced (cf. Berger 1957: 112)³².

It is evident that Epic Sanskrit enjoins us to reconsider the whole phenomenon of the *syncopation* of vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan and to look for the special conditions under which it takes place. Vowels are syncopated, as far as I can see, only in words or word elements that are "phonetically weak" – to borrow Turner's term (Coll. Papers p. 291) – such as (I) second members of compounds, (II) enclitics, (III) suffixes and (IV) terms of address.

³¹ Cf. Wackernagel, Kl. Sch. p. 497, Tedesco 1947: 176, Berger 1955: 18 n. 14.

³² Geiger's second example, *oka-* from *udaka-*, is very problematic (cf. Tedesco 1947: 176), since there is only one single place where *oka-* certainly means "water", viz. Vin I 253,14: *okapunnehi cīvarehi* "with cloaks filled with water" (not recorded by Geiger). So we have to allow for the possibility that it is a mere blunder of the text – the more so as it is obscure (pace Geiger's explanation) exactly where the *o-* comes from (should we read +*odapunnehi* with *oda-* wrongly abstracted from compounds like *niloda-*?).

1.2.2. *Preterites in ^oī(y)a*

In a great number of Prakrit texts we come across a petrified preterite form in ^oīa used for all numbers (in that respect resembling *āsi* [Pischel § 515]): *acchīa*, *āsiya*, *genhīa*, *vasīya*³³. So far no explanation of these ^oī(y)a pasts has been given. I think Pischel was on the right track when he supposed that this form must be an optative, “as inexplicable as this seems” (Pischel § 466). Now it is a well known fact that in non-standard Sanskrit an optative can be used in place of a past tense³⁴; and we know that optatives were used as preterites in Prakrit, too³⁵. As we have ^oīta-optatives — since late Vedic times even in the thematic conjugation (cf. Hoffmann 1976: 371)³⁶ — I suggest that the cited Prakrit form is the continuation of an ^oīta-optative. At the moment I can cite only one, but very instructive example: *pary-a-rundhīta*, R 4,1143*, which corresponds to *pratyarautsīt*, 4,1144*! Once this ^oīa was deemed an ending of the past tense, it was even appended to aorist stems (*kāsīya*, *kahesīya*, *thāsīya*).

2. Late Vedic, Epic Sanskrit, Pāṇini and Pali

The relationship of Pali to late Vedic on the one hand and to Pāṇini's Sanskrit (especially to the *bhāṣā* he described) on the other has

³³ These forms are discussed and text references are given by (e.g.) Alsdorf 1935/37: 325 (= Kl. Sch. p. 62), Bhayani / Shah 1987: 44, and Balbir 1989: 510-512 (with literature); cf. Alsdorf 1957: 207 n. 1 (= Kl. Sch. p. 191 n. 1) and Bollée 1995: 144 (s.v. *-īya*).

³⁴ Cf. BHSG § 32.85-105, Dschi 1949: 250 n. 1, Upadhye 1943: 100, Katre 1937, 1938 and 1939.

³⁵ Cf. Pischel § 466, von Hinüber § 445 and Balbir 1989: 509 with n. 39.

³⁶ For the Mahābhārata cf. *bhakṣayīta*, Mbh 13,107.82, *vivarjayīta*, Mbh 5,39.35, *prativāsayīta*, Mbh 5,37.31, *yājayīta*, Mbh 3,197.35. Interestingly enough, the Rāmāyaṇa does not seem to know such forms.

never been systematically investigated (cf. von Hinüber 1983: 308-310). But even a cursory reading of the Jātakas brings a number of further parallels to light.

2.1. *iva* instead of *eva*

Since late Vedic times *iva* is used “in the sense practically of *eva*” (Keith 1920: 89, cf. id. 1908: 1192-1193): *prsthata ivāgnīdhrām kṛtvā* “placing the Agnīdh's altar at his back”, AitB 1.30, *yadi ha vā api bahava iva yajante* “even if many sacrifice”, AitB 2.2, *so 'je jyuktamām ivāramata* “[The camel] dwelt for the longest time in the goat”, AitB 2.8³⁷. The same usage is met with in Epic Sanskrit: *tato nātimahān kālah samatīta ivābhavat* “Not too long a time had passed since then”, Mbh 1,35.3, *prāñjalim prahvam āśinam abhivikṣya smayann iva* “smiling as he looked at him ...”, R 2,4.42 (at least according to the explanation of Ck)³⁸. This probably accounts for the pleonastic collocation *iva* ... *yathā*: *vicikṣipur yathā śyenā nabhogatam ivāmiṣam* (◦-◦) “As vultures tear apart a piece of raw meat thrown into the air”, Mbh 2,33.6, *adhāryamāñā sraj ivottamā yathā* (◦-◦-/◦-◦-◦) “Like a beautiful garland that is not being worn”, Mbh 4,13.11 (cf. *kim mātūr arīke śayito yathā śiśuś / candram jighrkṣur iva manyase hi mām*, Mbh 4,13.21). The same phenomenon is met with in Pali (cf. CPD s.v. *iva*). On the other hand, *eva* is sometimes used where we would expect *iva*: *bhasmany eva hutāśanah*, Mbh 4,36.29 v.1. (crit. ed. *bhasmaneva* [cf. PW V,1222 s.v. *eva*]); *alāpūn' eva*, Dhp 149, *dhajaggān' eva dissare*, Ja VI 529,33* = 530,24*, *rohiṇī h' eva tamb' akkhi*, Ja VI 576,6* (emended by Alsdorf, Kl. Sch. p. 312 resp. 325, to *dhajaggānīva* resp. *hīva*); *macchā vesāliyā*

³⁷ Thieme pointed out this function of *iva* which he called “relativierend” (1963: 105 n. 2 [= Kl. Sch. p. 195 n. 2]).

³⁸ Cf. R 2,12.2, 108.6 (cf. Pollock. The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki. Vol. II. Ayodhyākāṇḍa. Note *ad loc.*) and 3,13.3.

c' eva udagass' abhiyāgama, Sūyagadāṅga 1.1.3.2 (or does *c' eva* represent *ca + iva*?).

2.2. *ca* instead of *ce*

Pāṇini 8.1.30 distinguishes between two words *ca* by adding to one the marker *n*. This *can* is, as is explained by Kātyāyana (*can* *nidviśiṣṭas* *cedarhe*), equivalent to *cet* “if”: *ayam ca vai marisyati* (=) *ayam cen marisyati* (Mahābhāṣya III 375,8). The greater “Petersburger Wörterbuch” cites several examples from Vedic literature (cf. Speyer 1896: § 282, Renou 1952: 384) and one from the Mahābhārata³⁹: *jīvitum cecchase mūḍha hetum me gadataḥ śrnu* “If you want to survive ...”, Mbh 3,256.10 (= 4, App.32.13 [v.l. *jīvam icchasi cen mūḍha*]). One more reference can be added: *vakṣyāmi* ... *manyase ca mām*, Mbh 13,38.5 (v.l. *cet*). This use of *ca* seems to have been obliterated in Classical Sanskrit⁴⁰. But it is quite often to be found in the Jātaka⁴¹: *ciram pi kho tam khādeyya gadrabho haritam yavam / ... ravamāno ca dūsayi* (↔↔-!) “The donkey would have eaten ... the barley for a long time if he had not come to harm by his cry”, Ja II 110,18*-19*, *idañ ca tuyham rucitam / Sutasoma ajj' evā dāni tvam pabbaja* “If this pleases you ...”, Ja V 185,22*⁴², *sakko ca⁴³ me varam dajjā / so ca labbhetha me varo* “If Sakka should give me a boon my choice would be quickly taken”, Ja V

³⁹ The stanza Bhartṛhari 2.45 cited by PW (*lobhaś cāsti gunena ...*) is Nītiśataka 37 and runs in Kosambi's edition as follows: *lobhaś ced aguṇena kim piśunatā yady asti kim pātakaiḥ!*

⁴⁰ For details cf. Gonda 1957: 52-54 (= Selected Studies I,371-373).

⁴¹ Cf. Gonda 1957: 54 (= Selected Studies I,373). Cf. Sūyagadāṅga 1.1.3.9: ... *loyam būyā, kade' tti ya* “If they maintain that ...” (cf. Bollée 1977: 112-113 and 193 s.v. *ya* [with a reference to Wackernagel, Kl. Sch. p. 257-261]).

⁴² The first *pāda* is a *bha-vipulā* (cf. Alsdorf 1968: 34) whose third syllable has to be a short one.

⁴³ Fausbøll's manuscript B^d reads *ce*.

216,1*⁴⁴, *sabbañ ca*⁴⁵ *maccā sadhanā sabhogā / ādīpitam dāru tinena missam* “If people would burn all wood ...”, Ja VI 206,9*, *etañ ca saccam vacanam bhavyeyya / ... / nākhattiyo jātu labhetha rajjam* “If this word were true ... no non-kṣatriya would obtain kingship”, Ja VI 208,1*/3*⁴⁶. The poets obviously use *ca* due to metrical exigencies as a “doublet prosodique” (Smith 1950: 3) of *ce*. And since *ca* is used in the sense of *ce*, *ce*, vice versa, sometimes stands for *ca*: *tathā mam saccam pāletu / pālayissati ce mamam* (↔↔!) “Hence truth should protect me – and surely, it will protect me”, Ja V 95,1*⁴⁷, *thale yathā +vāri janinda vattam / anaddhaneyyam aciratthitikam / evam pi ce hoti asatam samāgamo* “Like water rained down on dry land, not lasting, of no long permanence, so, o king, is the association with bad people”, Ja V 508,1*. Here *ce* is joined to *pi*⁴⁸ as often as is *ca*.

2.3. *su* as an *upasarga*

Pāṇini teaches in his rules 1.4.58-59 that *pra* etc. are called *upasargas* if they are linked directly to verbs. According to the corresponding *gāṇa* the word *su* belongs to this group. That means that *su* should be used as a verbal prefix! And indeed, we find several examples of this use in Epic Sanskrit: *sv-anuyāsyanti*, Mbh 8,22.59 v.l., *su-upastashe*, Mbh (cited by Whitney § 1121i without reference), *su-kurute*, Mbh 7,163.30 v.l., *sv-ajanayat*, Mbh 3,217.6 v.l. (ed. Bomb., not

⁴⁴ This line corresponds to Mvu III 6,15: *śakraś ca* (thus the manuscripts which Senart emended to *ce*) *me varam dadyāt*.

⁴⁵ According to Alsdorf (1977: 42) the Singhalese print (C) reads *ce*. But the third syllable of the *triṣṭubh-pāda* has to be a short one.

⁴⁶ If *bhuñjatu* can be used as a conditional the following example may be added: *idañ ca mayham uttiñthapindam / +tam mandavyo bhuñjatu appapañño / yakkhā ca te nañ na viheṭhayeyyum / putto ca te hohiti so arogo*, Ja IV 386,12*-15*.

⁴⁷ Cf. Lüders, Märchen 253.

⁴⁸ Cf. *pubbe va dānā sumanā bhavāma / dadam pi ce* (B^d *ca*) *attamanā bhavāma*, Ja IV 53,15* (cf. Kern, Toev. I/108).

noted by CE [cf. PW s.v. 6. su]), *su-dhāsyati*, Mbh 1,114.31, *su-rocaya*, Mbh 4,1.8 v.l., *su-virājate*, Mbh 4,60.4 v.l., *su-śakyante*, R 2,30.4 v.l. The same holds true for Pali: *kim sū-vadhītvā na kadāci socati*, Ja V 141,10*, corresponding to Mvu III 370,1* *kim so-vadhītvā na kadāci soci* (cf. Smith 1950: 13)⁴⁹, (*mā*) *su-nandi* ... *mā su-soci*, Ja I 300,20* (*sukāro nipātamattam*, ct.), *su-māpaya*, Cariyāp. 9.107, *su-māpayi*, Cariyāp. 9.108, Mahāvaṃsa, App. A stanza 3 (ed. Geiger p. 326 n. 3), *su-boddhum* Kaccāyanappakaraṇa 200 (ed. Senart [cf. Childers s.v. su at the end]), cf. (with a participle:) *su-codiyantam*, Ja VI 249,1* (*sūthu codiyantam*, ct.)⁵⁰.

3. Vocabulary

But Pali and Epic Sanskrit can not only be adduced to confirm Pāṇini's rules as far as syntactical features are concerned, but also to confirm his teaching on how to form words with particular meanings. On the other hand, taking into account Pāṇini and late Vedic texts enables a number of Pali words of obscure meaning to be explained. First an example of the latter kind:

3.1. *udaṅgana-* (Ja I 109,15*)

For this word the PED gives the meaning “an open space” – whereas the CPD gives no meaning at all – relying on the explanation of the commentary: *udaṅgane ti ettha uda iti nipāto, aṅgane ti attho, manussānam samcaranātthāne anāvate bhūmibhāge ti attho* (I 109,20'-21'). This is, of course, impossible, so another explanation is called for. We have in Pali *ulunka-* / *ulunka-* “ladle, spoon (for fetching water)”

⁴⁹ It cannot be ruled out that we have to do with *so* for *sū*, the regular outcome of *svid* (cf. Edgerton s.v. *so*).

⁵⁰ Cf. *Alāra etā su te +kāmakārā*, Ja V 170,29*.

(cf. Ja I 120,23, 423,14) which corresponds to Skt. *udañka-* (Mānavaśrautasūtra 1.1.2, Pāṇ 3.3.123)⁵¹. This word is derived from *ud-va(ñ)c-*; this root denotes, as we know from Vedic texts (cf. Hoffmann 1975: 162-165), the action of drawing water (cf. *udañcanī*, Ja I 417,10* [*udakam añcanti etāya*, ct.]). It seems – despite all phonetic difficulties – that *udañgana-* belongs to this very root: *akilāsuno vanñupathe khañantā / udañgane tattha papām avindum* “untiringly digging in the desert⁵² they found there a watering place⁵³ for drawing up [the bucket]” (Ja I 109,15*). The fondness of the poet of the stanza under discussion for “dark” words (*papā-*, *akilāsu-*, *vanñu[patha]-*)⁵⁴ may account for this quite unusual sound change. We meet with a similar case of a transition of a (voiced) palatal into a guttural, and of a dental nasal into a cerebral, in certain derivations from *vāñj* both in Pali (*an- / nir- / s'-Jāngana-* “dirt”) and in Pkr. (*abbhañgana-*, *nirañgana-* [Pischel § 234]).

3.2. *koleyyaka-* (Ja I 177,2*)

Pāṇini teaches in rule 4.2.96 (*kula-kuksi-grīvābhyaḥ śvāsy-alamkāresu*; cf. 4.1.140) that the suffix ^oeyaka- is added to the word *kula-* to denote a “dog of good breed”. Our dictionaries show that the word *kauleyaka-* is found as late as the Kādambarī and Harṣacarita. Some

⁵¹ This word should be added to the examples given by Oberlies 1995a: 191 of the dissimilation of *-d-* to *-l-* before a following nasal.

⁵² For this meaning of *vanñupatha-*, which is borne out by the prose-tale (cf. Ja I 107,23), cf. Lévi 1925: 47.

⁵³ We learn from Kātyāyana's *vārttika* 4 ad Pāṇ 3.3.58 that the word *prapā-* denotes a “place for supplying water” (cf. von Hinüber 1983: 309). In the Jātaka the word is attested one more time: *yathā nadī ca pantho ca pānāgāram sabhā papā / evam lokitthiyo nāma nāsam kujjhanti pāṇḍitā*, Ja I 302,3* (for further references cf. PED s.v.; cf. Sadd p. 622 n. 18).

⁵⁴ Also the employment of the locative to denote purpose seems to be rather idiosyncratic.

centuries earlier it is found in the Jātaka: Ja I 177,2*, II 348,21(*) v.l. (B⁴), IV 437,18.

3.3. *gīveyya-* (Ja IV 395,17*, VI 590,9*)

According to the same rule of Pāṇini (4.2.96), the word *grāiveyaka-* is formed to denote a piece of jewellery. Compared with the rather late attested Sanskrit word (Devīmāhātmya, Daśakumāracarita, Sāhityadarpana) the Pali word *gīveyya-* occurs in old texts (Ja IV 395,17*, VI 590,9*; °*eyyaka-*, V 297,14 [for further references cf. PED s.v. *gīveyyaka*]).

Freiburg i. Br.

Thomas Oberlies

Literature

Alsdorf 1928	L. Alsdorf. Der Kumārapālapratibodha. Hamburg 1928 (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 2).
Alsdorf 1935/37	Id. The Vasudevahīṇḍi, a Specimen of Archaic Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī. BSOS 8 (1935/37) 319-333 (= Kl. Sch. p. 56-70).
Alsdorf 1957	Id. The story of Citta and Sambhūta. Felicitation Volume presented to S. K. Belvalkar. Benares 1957, 202-208 (= Kl. Sch. p. 186-192).
Alsdorf 1968	Id. Die Āryā-Strophen des Pali-Kanons. Wiesbaden 1968 (AWLM 1967.4).
Alsdorf 1977	Id. Das Bhūridatta-Jātaka. WZKS 21 (1977) 25-55.

Balbir 1989 N. Balbir. Morphological Evidence for Dialectal Variety in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī. In: *Dialectes dans les littératures Indo-Aryennes* (ed. by C. Caillat). Paris 1989, 503-525.

Bechert 1955 H. Bechert. Vokalkürzung vor Sandhikonsonant. *MSS* 6 (1955) 7-26.

Bechert 1958 Id. Grammatisches aus dem Apadānabuch. *ZDMG* 108 (1958) 308-316.

Berger 1955 H. Berger. Zwei Probleme der mittelindischen Lautlehre. München 1955.

Berger 1957 Id. Bemerkungen zur Endung der 1. pl. präs. im Mittelindischen. *MSS* 11 (1957) 109-112.

Bhayani 1953 H. C. Bhayani. Paumacariu of Kavirāja Svayambhūdeva. Part First. Bombay 1953.

Bhayani / Shah 1987 H. C. Bhayani / R. M. Shah. Vasudevahinī Madhyama Khaṇḍa. Part I. Ahmedabad 1987.

Bollée 1977 W. B. Bollée. Studien zum Sūyagada. Wiesbaden 1977.

Bollée 1995 W. B. Bollée. The Nijjuttis on the Seniors of the Śvetāmbara Siddhānta: Āyāranga, Dasaveyāliya, Uttarajjhāyā and Sūyagada. Stuttgart 1995.

Chatterji 1983 S. K. Chatterji. On the Development of Middle Indo-Aryan. Calcutta 1983.

Dschi 1949 Hiän-li Dschi. Die Verwendung des Aorists als Kriterium für Alter und Ursprung buddhistischer Texte. *NAWG* 1949, 245-301.

Ghatage 1937 A. M. Ghatage. Instrumental and Locative in Ardha-Māgadhi. IHQ 13 (1937) 52-58.

Ghatage 1941 Id. Introduction to Ardha-Māgadhi. Kolhapur 1941.

Ghatage 1953 Id. A Locative Form in Paumacariya. Summaries of the All-India Oriental Conference 16 (1953) 116-117.

Gonda 1957 J. Gonda. The Use of the Particle *ca*. Vāk 5 (1957) 1-73 (= Selected Studies I,320-392).

von Hinüber 1968 O. von Hinüber. Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli, besonders des Vinaya-Piṭaka. München 1968.

von Hinüber 1983 Review of H. Bechert (ed.). Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung. Göttingen 1980. IF 88 (1983) 307-312.

von Hinüber 1986 Id. Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick. Wien 1986 (cited as von Hinüber).

Hoffmann 1975 K. Hoffmann. Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik. Band 1. Wiesbaden 1975.

Hoffmann 1976 Id. Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik. Band 2. Wiesbaden 1976.

Hopkins 1903 E. W. Hopkins. Limitation of time by means of cases in Epic Sanskrit. AJP 24 (1903) 1-24.

Insler 1994 St. Insler. Rhythmic Effects in Pali Morphology. Die Sprache 36 (1994) 70-93.

Jacobi 1886 H. Jacobi. Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāshṭrī. Leipzig 1886.

Jacobi 1918 Id. Bhavisatta Kaha von Dhaṇavāla. München 1918.

Katre 1937 S. M. Katre. Epic *iyāt* and Blends of Aorist and Optative Forms. JAOS 57 (1937) 316-317.

Katre 1938 Id. Epic *iyāt*. NIA 1 (1938) 536.

Katre 1939 Id. Apropos Epic *iyāt*. BDCRI 1 (1939) 8-13.

Keith 1908 B. Keith. Review of J. Hertel. Ausgewählte Erzählungen aus Hemacandra's Pariśiṣṭaparvan (Leipzig 1908). JRAS 1908, 1191-1193.

Keith 1920 Id. Rigveda Brāhmaṇas: The Aitareya and Kauśitaki Brāhmaṇas of the Rigveda. London 1920 (Delhi 1981³).

Kielhorn 1898 F. Kielhorn. The Jātakas and Sanskrit Grammarians. JRAS 1898, 17-21 (= Kl. Sch. p. 294-298).

Kulkarni 1946 E. D. Kulkarni. Epic Variants. Case Variation in the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata. BDCRI 7 (1946) 1-219.

Lévi 1925 S. Lévi. Ptolémée, le Niddesa et la Br̥hatkathā. PEFEO 22 (1925) 1-55.

Lüders 1954 H. Lüders. Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons. Berlin 1954.

Meenakshi 1983 K. Meenakshi. Epic Syntax. New Delhi 1983.

Oberlies 1995 Th. Oberlies. Beiträge zur Pali-Lexikographie. IIJ 38 (1995) 105-147.

Oberlies 1995a Id. Die Wurzel *gad* im Mittelindischen. HS 108 (1995) 190-191.

Oberlies 1996 Id. Stray remarks on Pali phonology, morphology, and vocabulary (Some addenda to Geiger's Pali grammar). MSS 1996 (forthcoming).

Pathak 1969 R. A. Pathak. Some linguistic peculiarities in the Purāṇas. *Purāṇa* 11 (1969) 119-126.

Pisani 1934 V. Pisani. Glosse marginali al *Mahābhārata*. *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 15 (1934) 65-75.

Pisani 1946 Id. On some peculiarities of the use of cases in the Ādiparvan. *NIA* 8 (1946) 187-190.

Pisani 1952 Id. Noterelle Pāli. *Rendiconti del Istituto Lombardo dei scienze e lettere* (Classe di lettere). 85 (1952) 279-288.

Renou 1952 L. Renou. *Grammaire de la langue védique*. Lyon 1952.

Sen 1958 S. Sen. *History and pre-history of Sanskrit*. Mysore 1958.

Singh 1980 R. A. Singh. *Syntax of Apabhramśa*. Calcutta 1980.

Smith 1950 H. Smith. Les deux prosodies du vers Bouddhique. *Human. Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse* 1949-1950, I.

Smith 1954 Id. *Analecta rhythmica. Studia Orientalia* (edidit *Societas Orientalis Fennica*) XIX: 7 (1954) 3-17.

Speijer 1886 J. S. Speijer. *Sanskrit Syntax*. Leiden 1886 (reprinted Delhi 1993).

Speijer 1896 Id. *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*. Strassburg 1896 (Grundriß der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde I,6).

Tedesco 1947 P. Tedesco. Sanskrit *pudgala* “body; soul”. *JAOS* 67 (1947) 172-177.

Thieme 1963 P. Thieme. *āścarya-*. ZvS 78 (1963) 104-111 (= Kl. Sch. p. 194-201).

Upadhye 1943 A. N. Upadhye. *Bṛhatkathākośa* of Āchārya Hariṣena. Bombay 1943.

Upadhye 1944 Id. The Dhūrtākhyāna: A Critical Study. In: Śri Jina Vijaya Muni. Dhūrtākhyāna of Haribhadra Sūri. Bombay 1944, 1-56.

Upadhye 1974 Id. Prabhācandra's Ārādhanā-Kathā-Prabandha or Kathākośa. New Delhi 1974 (Māṇikachandra D. Jaina Granthamālā No. 55).

de Vreese 1955 K. de Vreese. Did Middle Indian know an abl. sg. m. n. in *-am*? BSOAS 17 (1955) 369-371.

de Vreese 1953 Id. Dravidismen in het latere Pali. Handelingen van het Twintigste Vlaams Filologencongres. Antwerpen 1953, 96-99.

de Vreese 1980 Id. Dravidian Idioms in Later Pali. Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica 11 (1980) 179-222.

de Wijesekera 1993 O. H. de A. Wijesekera. Syntax of the Cases in the Pāli Nikāyas. Colombo 1993 (Thesis, University of London, 1936).

The *Paramatthajotikādipani, a Fragment of the Subcommentary to the Paramatthajotikā II on the Suttanipāta*

Subcommentaries on texts of the Khuddakanikāya are known to have existed so far only from the evidence found in the Piṭakat samuīn¹. Consequently, it came as a pleasant surprise, when a fragmentary manuscript copied as early as in CS 894 corresponding to 1532 A.D. came to light in the collection of Vat Lai Hin near Lampang in Northern Thailand². The text of this fragment covers Pj II 513,16 on Sn 770 in the Kāmasutta of the Mahāvagga up to Pj II 548,29 on Sn 848, the first verse of the Purābheda-sutta of the Atṭhakavagga.

The cover leaves at the beginning and at the end of the single fascicle extant communicate only the title given erroneously as *tīkā* (sic!) *suttanipāta aṅguttara* (!)³ and the year without containing a complete colophon. Therefore the real title of this subcommentary can be inferred only from the titles given at the end of the single Suttas of the Suttanipāta such as Kāmasuttavaṇṇanādipanī. Thus “Paramatthajotikādipani” is nothing more than a likely guess⁴.

* The abbreviations used follow the system laid down in the Epilegomena to the Critical Pāli Dictionary.

¹ On the Piṭ-sm cf. O.v.Hinüber: A Handbook of Pāli Literature. Berlin 1996 § 4. - The only exception is the Linatthappakāsinī on the Jātaka, cf. *ibidem* § 261 and 359.

² This collection will be described in: O.v.Hinüber: Die Pāli-Handschriften des Klosters Lai Hin bei Lampang/Thailand (under preparation), where this manuscript is listed as no. 63, see also JPTS 22.1996, p. 35–37.

³ In spite of the fact that *su-* is clearly written, the scribe seems to have thought of the Sattakanipāta in the Aṅguttaranikāya.

⁴ It is not impossible that the correct title is Paramatthasūdanī rather, if Nāṇamoli: The Illustrator of Ultimate Meaning (Paramatthajotikā) Part I. London 1960, p. V is correct in taking Ādīccavamsa's Paramatthasūdanī mentioned in Piṭ-sm to cover also Pj II, but cf. CPD (Epilegomena) 2.5.1,12 and 2.5.5,12.

The manuscript itself also contains quite a few mistakes, partly corrected by the scribe himself. These corrections have not been marked in the following transcript in detail. Obvious additions or omissions, however, have been indicated by square brackets: [“wrong addition by the scribe”] and pointed brackets: <“omission by the scribe”> respectively. Variants found in the *pratikas* are mentioned after the quotations from Pj II or Sn. The vowels *i*/*ī* are often confused by the scribe as usual in the South East Asian Pāli tradition. This has not been normalized.

The text published here is the first half of fascicule no. 6 containing the folios marked as *ta-tah*. This corresponds to about 35 pages of the printed edition of Pj II. Consequently, the preceding five fascicles should have contained the text corresponding to approximately only 350 pages instead of 512. The gap of about 160 pages missing cannot be explained, if the relation between this subcommentary and Pj II is the same all over the text as it is in the present fragment. Even if it varies, the missing text of almost 2½ fascicles is much longer than to be expected.

The anonymous author of the subcommentary used not only Pj II (his basic text), but also Nidd I, which he refers to occasionally. Besides, a remarkable number of technical terms occurs even within in this brief fragment: *atthuppatti-sankhāta-samuṭṭhāna* (Sn 772: 514,5-515,29⁵; cf. on this technical use of *samuṭṭhāna*: Pj I 118,2 : Pj II 300,2 and *suttavatthubhūtassa atthassa uppattikāle*, 521,5); *avutta-sampindattha* (533,2 “enumeration, which is not quoted in full”); *ekasesarūpakanayena* (536,7, cf. Sadd 6.2.3, CPD s.v. *ekasesa*, and L.Renou, Terminologie grammaticale. Paris 1957, p. 115 s.v. *ekaśeṣa*); *tatvakathā* (514,3, meaning uncertain); *nipātamattam* (516,11; Sn 827b);

⁵ These numbers refer to the part of Pj II commented upon.

desanānusandhi (513,32); *pana-saddo pakkhantaratho* (522,21); *pariyāyākathā* (514,3, cf. Sadd 6.1.2.1); *pāṭha* (516,19 etc.); *piṇḍattha* (514,3, cf. Sadd 6.2.1); *pucchānusandhi* (537,27); *purisavippalāsa* (545,23, cf. Sadd 2.3.3); *yathānusandhi* (514,3, cf. Sadd 5.3.2.1; Ja VI 477,21); *yojanā* (520,24 etc., cf. Sadd 6.2.1); *sambandha* (522,25 etc.).

Furthermore, the following cases and their respective functions are mentioned: acc.: *kammatthe upayogavacanam* (516,12); abl.: *nissakke yeva nissakkam* (517,11); gen.: *niddhārane chaṭṭhi* (522,29); loc.: *niddhārane bhummam* (541,10); *nimittatthe bhummam* (541,13); *bhāvalakkhaṇe bhummam hetumhi vā* (541,17; 548,14, cf. Sadd 5.1.0); *sāmiatthe bhummam* (521,27).

At the beginning of the subcommentary on the Purābheda-sutta (Pj II 548,14), a series of six *suttas* is mentioned, which are grouped together already in Pj II 548, 12-14. The Sammāparibbājaniyasutta is indeed characterized in Pj II as: ... *rāgacaritavasena* ... *devatāganānam* ... *pannarasa gāthāyo abhāsi*, Pj II 362,11-15. The other characteristics, however, such as *mohacarita* etc. do not seem to be mentioned in the relevant paragraphs of Pj II introducing the *suttas* of this group.

—

tthām saccavacanam. tenāha **abālattā** (E° abalā va) **baliyantī** (Sn 770) **ti attho** (Pj II 513,16) **ti. pākaṭaparisayā** (Pj II 513,18 °ssayā) **ti cakkhūnam** āpātham āgatāvasena parisahanādi-atthena pākaṭaparisayā. **niṭṭhāpesī** (Pj II 513, 32) **ti** desanānusandhinā niṭṭhāpesī **kāmasuttavāṇṇanā** (Pj II 514,3) **ti** ayam yathānusandhivasena piṇḍatthavasena ca, vāṇṇanāvithārena pana *Kāmasuttassa* (Sn 776-771) vāṇṇanā *Niddese* (Nidd I 1,6-22,7) tatvakathāya (?) *pariyāyākathāya* ca vasena vāṇṇitā va. **samattā** (cf. niṭṭhitā, Pj II 514,3) **ti** pariniṭṭhitā, **samgahetvā** vā attā vuttā **ti attho**.

Kāmasuttavāṇṇanādīpanī samattā (Pj II 514,3)

abahulakatā (Pj II 514,26 abahukatā) ti anādaram katvā. **ruddho**⁶ (Pj II 514,26 ruṭṭho) ti ativiya kuddho. **aññātukāmo** (Pj II 515,5) ti jānitukāmo. **taṁ anukampamāno** (Pj II 515, 10) ti tasmi karuṇam kurumāno. **āsādetun** (Pj II 515, 14) ti ghaṭetum. **satto guhāyan** (Sn 772) ti guhaṭṭhakasuttam. **pa. idam** **suttam abhāsi** (Pj II 514,5-515,29) ti idam athuppattisaṅkhātasamuṭṭhānam. **rāgādīnam** **vālānam** **vasanokasato** (Pj II 515,30f.) ti rāgadosamohādīnam atīnam (?)⁷ russatṭhena vāli(!)migasadisānam visayavasena āraṇakaraṇavasena⁸ vasanaṭṭhānabhāvato. **ajhattabandhanan**⁹ (Pj II 515,32) ti kāyasaṅkhātam ajhatikam bandhanatṭhānam. **bahiddhābandhanan** (Pj II 516,1) ti rūpādikāmaguṇasaṅkhātam bahiddhābandhanatṭhānam. **vivekā** (Pj II 516,3) ti vivekato. **tathārūpo** (Pj II 516,2) ti *sato* (!) *guhāyan* (Sn 772) ti ādippakāro. **vivekā** *hi* (Sn 772c = Pj II 516,1) ti ettha *hi* ti nipātamattam. **sattadhammatan** (Pj II 516,7 sattānam dhammatam) ti sattānam pakatibhāvam. **sukhavedanādīmhi** (Pj II 516,9) ti ettham ādisaddena iṭṭhavatthuyobbañña-ārogyajīvitādayo samgaṇhāti. **bhavasātē** (Pj II 516,9f.) ti ettha bhavesu sātasukhavedanādissa rammaṇikam. **bandhā** (Pj II 516,10 baddhā) ti laggito (!). **bhavasātavatthubhūtā dhammā** (Pj II 516,10f.) ti bhave sukhass' ādivatthubhūtā dhammā vatthusampadādayo. **tatthā** (Pj II 516,11) ti bhavasātavatthubhūtesu dhammesu. **duppamocayā** (Pj II 516,11f.) ti dukkhena pamocetabbā. **aññā**¹⁰ **cā** (Pj II 516,12 aññē ca) ti kammatthe upayogavacanam. **yadi pana muñceyyun** (Pj II 516,14 mucceyyum) ti sac' eva sabbasattā vaṭṭadukkhato muñceyyum. **bandhiyamānā** (Pj II 516,19 patthayamānā) ti patthayamānā so yeva vā pāṭho. **dvinnam** **padānan** (Pj II 516,19) ti apekkhamānapadapa(!)-

⁶ I.e. *ruddo* ?

⁷ Read *ativiya* ?

⁸ Cf. CPD s.v. *arāṇa* ?

⁹ The scribe uses regularly *-jha-* for *-jjha-*. This is a feature quite common in Northern Thai Pāli manuscripts.

¹⁰ Sic: *-ā* cancelled, no *-e* written.

jappapadānam¹¹. **apekkhamāna** (Pj II 516,21) ti icchamānā. **itarathā** (Pj II 516,21) ti sambandhato aññena asambandhākarena atthe gañhamāne sati. **pariyesanā-ti-<ā>din** ti (Pj II 516,27 pariyesanādin) ti ettha ādisaddena rakkhanāsayo sañgāñhāti. **avañgamanatāyā** (Pj II 516,28) ti nirayapettivisayatiracchānayonisañkhātalāmakatthānagamanatāya. **macchariyatāyā** (Pj II 516,29 maccharitāya) ti macchariyadhammasamannāgatāya. **antakāle** (Pj II 516,30) ti marañakāle. **marañadukkh<u>panitā** (Pj II 516,30f.) ti marañam dukkham pattattā. **tīsu bhajavissāmā** (Pj II 516,31 kim su bhavissāma) ti nerayikāya pettivisayatiracchānayonisañkhātā bhavissāmā ti ādinā vitthārattho veditabbo. **ettad evā** (Pj II 516,32) ti kāmagiddhasattassa etam dukkhasambhavānam hoti kāmesu do<sa>sambhavām vā. **āpajjeyyā** (Pj II 516,33) ti padhānavasena vuttam jāneyyā ti ādi attho sambhavati. **na tassa hetū** (Sn 775c) ti pāñātipātādivisamassa hetu. **visamañ na careyyā** (Sn 775c om. na) ti pubbabhāgabhūtam lobhadosādihetuvisamam na careyya. **appan tiñhi¹²** (Sn 775d) ti parittattāya sarasaparittatāya parittam. **ye na karontī** (Pj II 517,3 ye tathā na karonti) ti ye bhagavato vacanām na karonti. **ito c' ito cā** (Pj II 517,6) ti tañhādīhi diññibhyasanapariyosānehi. **hīnakammantā(!)n** (Pj II 517,9 °kammantā) ti kāyakammādipāpakkammavantā. **kāmabhavādikā** (Pj II 517,11 kāmabhavādisu) ti nissakke yeva nissakkañ. **okāran** (Pj II 517,22) ti lāmakañ. **yañ attānam garahi** (Pj II 517,31 attanā garahati) ti yena kattatā-akattatāsañkhātena kārañena hetubhūtena attanā va sattānam garahi nindi. **dvinnam lepānan** (Pj II 517,33) ti tañhādidiññilepānam. **pubbabhāge** (Pj II 518,7) ti lokuttara-†dhappetito¹³ pubbabhāge.

Guhatthakasuttavanñanādīpanī samattā. (Pj II 518,15)

¹¹ Pj II 516,21: *jappam*.

¹² Read *appañ hi tam* as Sn.

¹³ The reading is quite clear in the manuscript: °*dhamme* (?) *thito* (??).

na upeti (Sn 780c = Pj II 520,2) ti kodhadosavasena na upeti na upavadati. **natthi rāgādikhilam** etassā ti **natthi khilo** (Sn 780d = Pj II 520,2). **kuhiñci** (Sn 780d = Pj II 520,3) ti ajhattabāhiddhādike kasmi thāne. **sabbato** (Pj II 520,15) ti sabbaññhānesu. **yāyam** **diññhi** (Pj II 520,22) ti lobhappadhāna-akusalacittupādasañkhātā diññhi. **so** (Pj II 520,24) ti titthiyajano. **yo vā yassa sassatādivādo** (Pj II 520,27 yo vā sassatādivā¹⁴) ti yassa titthiyajanassa sassato loko ti ādi diññhivādo. **so** (Pj II 520,24) titthiyajano ti diññhivādañ accayeyyā (Sn 781a) ti yojanā. **tena diññhichandenā** (Pj II 520,28) ti tena diññhisañkhātena chandena. **anunīto** (Sn 801b = Pj II 520,28) ti anu punappunañ nīto. **niviññho** (Sn 781b = Pj II 520,29) ti paññithito. **yathā jāneyyā** (Sn 781d = Pj II 520,31) ti sassato loko ti ādinā nayena diññhivādena jāneyya. **tassā** (Pj II 521,5) ti sutassa. **atthupappatiyan** (Pj II 521,5) ti suttavatthubhūtassa atthassa uppattikāle. **anariyadhammo eso** (Pj II 521,11) ti anariyānam puggalānam sabhāvo ayam vādo. **iti silesū** (Pj II 521,14) ti evam silesu. **tassa tan** (Pj II 521,16) ti puggalassa. **tañ akatthanam** (Pj II 521,16) avikatthanam. **eso** (Pj II 521,17) ti eso akatthanasabhāvattho. **rāgādayo satta ussadā** (Pj II 521,19) ti rāgadosamohamānam diññhikilesassa kammassa d<uccarit>asañkhātā¹⁵ satta ussadā. **purato katā** (Pj II 521,26) ti padhānabhāvato katā. **attanī** (Sn 784c = Pj II 521,27) ti ettha attasadde diññhivācako sāmiatthe ca bhūmman ti āha *attani tassādiyā* (Pj II 521,30) ti. **yan** (Pj II 521,27 = Sn 784c: yad) ti padassa yasmā yam phalan ti dvīdhā attho yujjati. **tañ cā** (Pj II 522,2) ti tassā micchādiññhiyā ānisañsañ ca. **kuppatāyā** (Pj II 522,2) ti bhañgavasena ku[maj]ppasa-bhāvāya. **pañiccasamuppannatāya ca** (Pj II 522,3) ti attano paccayehi pañiccasamuppannā sabhāvāya. **samutisantitāyā** (Pj II 522,3 sammu° °tatāya) ti diññhigatikānam vohāravasena santisabhāvāya ca. *Mahāniddeṣe satthakathāyam* pana (Nidd-a I 201,26-29): “tasmā tañ ca ānisañsam tañ ca kuppatāya ca samutisantikāya ca kuppapañicca-santisañkhātam diññhim

¹⁴ N.b. v.l. in E^o!

¹⁵ Ms. *dasankhātā*, cf. Pj II 425,29.

ca nissito hotī” ti pātho dissati¹⁶. **evam nissitena cā** (Pj II 522,6) ti ditthi ca ditthānisam[da]sañ ca nissitena puggalena. imassa ca **sukhena ativattitabbā** (Pj II 522,9) ti iminā sambandho. **idam-saccābhinivesasañkhātānī** (Pj II 522,8) ti dvāsañthidhammesu yā kāci attanā abhirucitā idam saccam̄ moghamajhan ti abhinivesasañkhātā ditthi. **ditthīnivesanānī** (Pj II 522,8¹⁷) ti ettha nivisanti etthā ti ditthīnivesanāni. ditthiyo evam̄ nivesanāni ditthīnivesanāni. **pavattā** (Pj II 522,12 pavattattā) ti puggalena pavattāpitā. tesu yeva ditthīnivesanesu gahañarocanādivasena pavattam̄ vijjamānam̄ satthārañ ca dhammañ ca nidassati ca ādiyati cā ti yojanā. ajānam̄ sīlam̄ pakati ekassā ti **ajānasilo** (Pj II 522,15) satta¹⁸ sesapadesu es' eva nayo. **dhamma-kkhānāgañādibhedañ¹⁹ cā** (Pj II 522,17) ti ettha ādisaddena ditthipadāmagge samgañhāti. **yo panā** (Pj II 522,21) ti ettha panasaddo pakkhantaratho. **dhonadhammasammannāgamā** (Pj II 522,24) ti dosadhunananapaññāya samannāgatattā. **tassā ditthiyā abhāvā** (Pj II 522,25 abhāvena) ti tassa vuttapakārāya ditthiya abhāvena hetubhūtena. imassa ca **pahāyā** (Sn 786c) ti iminā sambandho. **titthiyā** (Pj II 522,27) aññadiitthigatikā ti. **yāya** (Pj II 522,28) māyāya katapāpapañcādanāya yena **mānena vā attanā katapāpakkammam̄ pañcchādento** (Pj II 522,28) micchādiitthisañkhātam̄ agantabbam̄ agatim̄ gacchanti (Pj II 522,28) pāpūnātī ti yojanā. **rāgādidosānan** (Pj II 522,29) ti niddhāraṇe chatthi. **kenā** (Sn782b = Pj II 522,29) ti kena dosena. **tesu tesu dhammesu** (Pj II 523,4) ti rāgādisu dhammesu hetubhūtesu.

Duṭṭhakaṭṭhasuttavaññanādīpanī samattā. (Pj II 523,16)

¹⁶ The omission of *pañcicasamuppannatāya* is confirmed neither by E^o nor by B^o; both have the same texts as Pj II E^o.

¹⁷ Ms. °vesantānī.

¹⁸ Ms. *sattha*.

¹⁹ Ms. °taññhā° corr. to °gañā°.

tassā (Pj II 526,9) ti suuttassa. **adhibgamā** (Pj II 526,12 avigamā) ti yāti uppa(!)kkamati hetutāya dassanassa. **tenāhā** (Pj II 526,19) ti tasmā tam maggaññāñam na hoti tasmā bhagavatā *diṭṭhena ce suddhī* (Sn 789a) ti dutiyagātham āhā ti sambandho. **āpannan** (Pj II 526,24) ti dosāpanthānam hoti. **tathā vadānan** (Sn 789d = Pj II 526,25) ti tathā vadantam. **idhā** (Sn 791d = Pj II 527,8) ti khandhādiloke micchāññena. **vā** (Sn 791d) ti viparītasabhāvena pavattāya paññāya. **pakubbamāno** (Sn 791d = Pj II 527,8) ti abhisañkhārādini karonto. **assā** (Pj II 527,9) ti dutiyatatiya-catutthapādāsañkhātassa padassa. **aparan** (Sn 791a = Pj II 527,17) ti satthārādi. **visenibhūto** (Sn 793a = Pj II 527,29) ti ettha vigatā mā<ra>senā etassā ti viseni, visenibhūtvā bhavati ti visenibhūto. **dvinnam purekkhārānam** (Pj II 528,10) ti tañhādiṭṭhisañkhātānam dvinnam purekkhārānam. **assā** (Pj II 528,18) ti *ekapuggalādhiṭṭhānāya desanāya* (Pj II 528,17). **sambandho** (Pj II 528,19) ti tidesanāsambandho. **kiñca bhiyyo** (Pj II 528,18) ti katamam guṇam adhikam vattabbam siyā ti yojanā. **catunnam kilesasimānam atitattā** (Pj II 528,20) ti: “catasso kilesasimāyo sakkāyadiṭṭhivicikicchā silabbata-parāmāso diṭṭhānusayo vicikicchānusayo tadekaṭṭhā ca kilesā ayam pathamā sīmā, olārikam kāmarāgasāññojanam paṭighasāññojanam olāriko kāmarāgānusayo <paṭighānusayo²⁰> tadekaṭṭhā ca kilesā ayam dutiyasimā, anusaha gatam kāmarāgasāññojanam paṭighasāññojanam anusahagatā²¹ kāmarāgānusayo paṭighānusayo tadekaṭṭhā ca kilesā ca ayam tatiyasimā rūparāgo arūparāgo māno uddhaccam avijjā mānānusayo bhavarāgānusayo avijjānusayo tadekaṭṭhā kilesā ca ayam catutthasimā. yato catuhi ariyamaggehi imā catasso sīmāyo atikkanto hoti samatikkanto vītivatto²² so vuccati sīmātigo²³” ti evam Niddese (Nidd I 99,24-100,5) vuttānam catunnam kilesasimānam atikkantattā. **itthambhūtassā** (Pj II 528,21) ti imam guṇappakāram pattassa. **tassā** (Sn 795a = Pj II 528,21)

²⁰ This has to be inserted following the text of Nidd I.

²¹ Ms °vatā.

²² Ms vivitanto.

²³ Ms. sīmātike.

khīnāsavabrahmaṇassa. **na virāgaratto** (Sn 795c = Pj II 528,25) ti viseso rāgo virāgo rūpārūparāgo. virāgena ratto virāgaratto.

Suddhaṭṭhakasuttavaṇṇanādīpanī samattā (Pj II 528,28).

yam ānisamsam passatī (Sn 797a yad, cf. Pj II 529,28-30) ti yojanā. **nihilato** (Sn 797d = Pj II 530,2) ti nihilabhāvato. **kīdisan** (Pj II 530,10) ti kidisam diṭṭhim na kappayeyyā (Sn 799a) ti yojanā. **yā kappiyatī** (Pj II 530,12) ti yā diṭṭhi diṭṭhigatikehi²⁴ vikappiyati. **etam diṭṭhin** (Pj II 530,13 om. etam) ti etam tādisam diṭṭhim. **hino na maññī**^{<e>}tha visesi vā pī (Sn 799d = Pj II 530,15) ti. **hino** (Pj II 530,15) ti attānam na maññeyya na avamaññeyya visesi avamaññeyya. **yam pubbe gahitan** (Pj II 530,15) ti yam pubbe gahitan diṭṭhigatam. **sa ve viyatthesū** (Sn 800c = Pj II 530,19 viyattesu²⁵) ti ettha sasaddassa attho so ti gahetabbo. **satthesū** (Pj II 530,20 sattesu) ti gatesu nānādiṭṭhigatesu. **phassādibhede** (Pj II 530,25²⁶) ti phassāsamudayādibhedo bhayakoṭṭhāse. **nivesanā** (Sn 801c) ti tanhādidiṭṭhi-saṅkhātā nivesanā. **dhammesū** (Sn 801d) ti dvāsaṭṭhi diṭṭhidhammesu. **nivaccheyyā** (Sn 801d niccheyya) ti nicchinitvā samuggahitaabhinivitthā nivesanā keci pi yassa na santi (Sn 801c²⁷) ti yojanā. **tesan** (Pj II 531,2) ti tehi khīnāsavehi. **na paṭ<i>cchitā** (Pj II 531,3) ti na sampaticchi.

Paramattha(sic)**suttavaṇṇanādīpanī** samattā (Pj II 531,7).

jātakādikathānan (Pj II 531,13 °kathanan) ti ettha ādisaddena samgaṇhāti. **ādinī** (Pj II 531,13) ti ettha ādisaddena heṭṭhā vuttāni tatraṭṭhitāni na ussukkasamudānatthan ti ādini janapadacārikanimittāni samgaṇhāti. bhuttāvino bhagavato brāhmaṇo bhattam niharāpesi²⁸. ti

²⁴ Ms. °gatiko hi.

²⁵ Cf. vv.ll.

²⁶ Cf. v.l. B^a.

²⁷ E^g om. pi, cf. v.l. in B^a.

²⁸ Reference unclear, cf.: bhuttāvino brāhmaṇo pattam apanāmesi, Pj II 532,13?

yojanā **pubbe** **va** **sannivāsenā** (Pj II 533,1*) ti etha vāsaddassa rassataṇi katan ti veditabbam. pubbe sannivāsenā vā ti vuttam hoti. tattha **pubbe** (Pj II 533,1*) ti aṭītajātiyam. **sannivāsenā** (Pj II 533,1*) ti sahavāsenā sahasaddass' atthe hi ayam sasaddo. **paccuppannāhitena** **vā** (Pj II 533,1*) ti paccuppanne vattamānabhāve hitacaraṇena vā, evam imehi²⁹ dvīhi kāraṇehi tam sinehasaṅkhātam pemam *jāyati* (Pj II 533,2* *jāyate*) uppajjati. idam vuttam hoti **pemam** (Pj II 533,2*) nām' etam dvi<hi> kāraṇehi jāyati purimabhāve mātā pi<ṭā> vā dhitā vāutto vā bhātaro vā bhagini vā pati vā bhariyā vā sahāyo vā mitto vā hutvā yo yena saddhim ekaṭṭhāne vutṭhapubbo tassa iminā pubbe vā sannivāsenā bhavantare pi anubandhanto so sineho na vijahati imasmi attabhāve katena puccuppannena hitena vā ti evam imehi dvīhi kāraṇehi tam pemam *jāyatī* ti. kiṃviyā ti āha: **uppalam** **vā** (!) **yathā** (Pj II 533,2*) ti ethāpi vāsaddassa rassataṇi katan ti daṭṭhabbam. avuttasampiṇḍattho c' etha vāsaddo tena padumādayo saṃgaṇhāti. yathāsaddo upamāyam. idam vuttam hoti yathā uppalañi ca sesañi ca padumā udake jāyamānā dve kāraṇāni nissāya jāyati. udakañi c'eva kalalañi ca tathā etehi dvīhi kāraṇehi pema jāyatī ti. **ṭhitiparitt<at>āyā** (Pj II 533,29) ti ṭhiti<la>kkhaṇassa parittatāya. **sa<ra>-saparittatāya** (Pj II 533,29) ti attano paccaya-bhūtānam kiccānam sampattīnam ca parittatāya. **miyatī** (Sn 804b = Pj II 533,31.33) ti maraṇam gacchati. **idan** (Sn 805b = Pj II 534,1) ti mamāyitavatthum. **mama** **upāsako** **bhikkhu** vā ti **saṅkham** **gato** (Pj II 534,3) ti mama upāsako mama sāvako vā bhikkhu vā *māmako* (Sn 806d) ti saṅkhā gato ti yojanā. **mamāyamāno** (Pj II 534,4) ti piyāyamāno. etam ādīnavam disvā *viditvā* *paññito* (Sn 806c) gahaṭṭho ca pabbajito ca mama sāvako tasmā dīṭṭhipamattāya mama attā mama santakan ti *na nametha*³⁰ (Sn 806d) na nameyyā ti sambandho. **petan** (Sn 807d) ti ito paralokagataṇi. **kālakatan** (Sn 807d) ti matam. **petassā** (Sn 808d) ti matassa. **jantuno** (Sn 808d) ti sattassa. **etan** (Pj II 534,25) ti attano adassanam. **sāmaggiyam** āhu tassa tan (Sn 810d = Pj II

²⁹ Ms. *imamehi*, cf. on *pemam*, Pj II 533,2* below.

³⁰ Ms. *na mapetha*.

534,14) ti ettha gaṇadhammaanabhinibbattisaṅkhātesu tīsu sāmaggiyesu tassa bhikkhuno anurūpavatthena anabhinibbattisāmaggiyam anabhinibbatiadhipetam. **paññe** (Sn 811d) ti pokkharapatte³¹. **ettha vā** (Pj II 534,22) ti diṭṭhasutesu³² vā. **tena vatthunā** (Pj II 534,25) ti taṇhādiṭṭhisaṅkhāte<na> vatthunā.

Jarāsuttavaṇṇanādīpanī samattā.

tissame<tte>yyā (Pj II 536,7) ti ettha tissatissame<tte>yyā ti vattabbe ekasesasarūpekanayena³³ tissametteyyā ti vuttam. pabbaj(!)āsaṅkhātenā (Pj II 536,16) ti pabbaj(!)ākoṭṭhāsena vā pabbajito ti samaṇo ti gaṇanāropanena vā. **gaṇava[va]ssaggagaṭṭhena vā** (Pj II 536,17) ti gaṇasaṅgaṇitārāmattam vissajjetvā vavakaṭṭhena vā. **bhāvan** (Pj II 536,27) ti pavattanam vāḍhanam vā. **methunan** (Pj II 536,31) ti methunarāgam. **saṅkappehī** (Pj II 536,31) ti kāmabyāpādadiṭṭhisankappasāṅkhātehi. iminā **kāraṇe[nā]nā** (Pj II 537,7) ti gilāno aham mātāpitatthe ca mayā bharitabbo ti ādinā kāraṇena. **mosavajjan** (Sn 819d = Pj II 537,12) ti musāvādaṁ. **pubbāparam** (Sn 821b = Pj II 537,15 °pare) ti methunam anuyuttassa. **pa. hīnam āhu puthujanan** (Sn 815a-816b) ti pubbavuttaādinavato paramparabhūtam. **arahattanikūṭena desanam niṭṭhapesi** (Pj II 537,27) ti idha tissametteyya-sutte pubbe methunadhammo āgato upari arahattaphalam āgataṁ hoti yasmā, tasmā phalanikūṭena pucchānusandhinā ca desanam niṭṭhapesi.

Tissametteyyasuttavaṇṇanādīpanī samattā. (Pj II 537,30).

jambū (Pj II 538,5) ti jamburukkho. **paññāṇan** (Pj II 538,5) ti paññāya naṭṭhena paṭivādaṁ. **anāsādento** (Pj II 538,7) ti paṭivacanadāyakam puggalam āpādetum alabhamāno. **kāraṇike** (Pj II 538,22) ti yuttam janante. **paññāpaṭibhānan** (Pj II 538,24) ti paññāya vattabbavacanam. **te** (Pj II 540,4*) ti yāni citrāni kāmāni te kāmetvā purisassa kāmo ti *na*

³¹ Ms. °*patto*.

³² Ms. *diṭṭhisutesu*.

³³ Ms. adds *yena* below the line.

vadesī (Pj II 540,4*) ti yojanā. **sarīrā**<śārā>**kappesū** (Pj II 540,15) ti sasarīrāya vesagamanādiākappesu ca. idh' evā (Sn 824a = Pj II 540,31) ti imasmi diṭṭhigate. **aññesu** **dhammesū** (Sn 824b) ti aññesu sāsana-dhammesu diṭṭhidhammesu ca. **paccekasaccesū** (Sn 824d = Pj II 541,3) ti paccekadiṭṭhisaccesu. **te** **vādakāmā** (Sn 825a) ti **gāthā** (Pj II 541,4) ti **te** **vādakāmā** (Sn 825a) ti-ādikā ayam gāthā evam nivitthānam micchādiṭṭhikānam visesā kā dassanavasena vuttā ti yojanā. **te** (Sn 825a) ti evam nivitthā diṭṭhigatikā. **bālato** (Pj II 541,6) ti bālabhāvato. **aññāsatthārādin** (Pj II 541,7 aññamaññasa°) ti aññam aññam satthārādim. *ubho pi janā evam saññino hutvā* (Pj II 541,9) ti yojanā. **evam** **vadānesu** **cā** (Pj II 541,10) ti kusalavadānesu, niddhāraṇe c'etam bhummam. **pubbe** **va** **vādā** (Pj II 541,14) ti vādato pubbe vādena yujhanato pubbe ti attho. **kathāṃkathāvinighātī** (Pj II 541,14 °vinipātī) ti kathāṃkathāya dakkhī hoti. **atthāpagatan** (Pj II 541,15) ti atthato vigataṃ. **te** (Pj II 541,15) ti tayā. **pañhavimamsakehī** (Pj II 541,15) ti pañhassa yuttāyuttabhāvaṃ jānantehi. **ariparihite**³⁴ (Pj II 541,16) chaddite ti attho. **vāde** (Pj II 541,17) ti mañkubhūtassa diṭṭhikassa vade. **evam** **apāhatasmi** **ca** **vāde** (Pj II 541,17) ti bhāvalakkhaṇe bhummam hetumhi vā. **yam assa** **vādan** (Sn 827a) ti yam tassa diṭṭhikassa vādaṃ. **yam assa** **vādan** (Sn 827a) ti **gāthā** (Pj II 541,20) ti ayam gāthā bhagavatā yathā vuttā gāthā dukkham pāpuṇātī ti yojanā. **pañham** **vimamsakā** **se** (Sn 827b) ti ettha se ti nipātamattam pañham vimamsakārino pārisajjā ti attho. **anaññāyā** (Pj II 541,22 aññam mayā !) ti ajānitvā. **āvajjitan** (Pj II 541,22) ti cajjitam. **tassa** **jayo** (Pj II 541,23) ti tassa paṭivādapuggalassa jayo. **jayaparājayādivasenā** (Pj II 541,28) ti ettha ādisaddena lābhālābhādayo samgaṇhātī. **ugghātan** (Pj II 541,28) ti uggatabhāvaṃ. **nighātan** (Pj II 541,29) ti heṭṭhāgatabhāvaṃ. **ugghāti** **nighātimā** **cā** (Pj II 541,29 va³⁵) ti etthā ugghāti ca nighāti cā ti ugghātinighāti assa atthī ti ugghātimā etthā ti vādesu. **sundaro** **ayan** (Pj II 541,34) ti ayam puggalo sundaro ti. **tattha** diṭṭhiyā (Sn 829a = Pj

³⁴ So ms., read *aparihārite*, E° *apasādite*, cf. v.ll.!

³⁵ Cf. v.l. B°: *ca* in E°.

II 541,31) ti tassa diṭṭhiyam, nimittatthe c' etam bhummam. **dīpetvā** (Pj II 542,1) ti ayaṁ *akkhāyā* (Sn 829b) ti imassa attho. **jayatthenā** (Pj II 542,2) ti jayasaṅkhātena atthena hetubhūtena. **dantam** *vidamṣabhbāvā* (Pj II 542,2 dantavidamṣakam) ti dantapakāsakatam. **yā uṇṇatī** ti **gāthā** (Pj II 542,5) ti *yā unṇatī* (Sn 830a) ti-ādikā gāthā tassa uṇṇamantassa diṭṭhigatikassa dosadassanavasena vuttā³⁶ ti yojanā. **vighātabhbūmī** (Sn 830a = Pj II 542,6) ti piṭanabhūmi. *yā unṇnamati*³⁷ (Sn 830a uṇṇati) ti *yā mānasaṅkhātauṇṇamanā*. **sāssa vighāta-
<bhū>mi** (Sn 830a) ti sā tassa [puggalavighātamī (!) ti sā tassa]³⁸ puggalassa vighātabhbūmipiṭanabhūmi. **tenā** (Pj II 542,13) ti diṭṭhigāhakādinā. **suddhin** (Sn 830d) ti nibbānasuddhim. **kusalā** (Sn 830d) ti khandhaṭyatanādisu chekā puggalā. **taṁ vādaṁ asam-
paṭicchakato** (Pj II 542,8 °paṭicchanto) ti pi pāṭho. ettha pi tvidhijhaṭ na vivādayethā ti tam vādaṁ sampaṭicchchantassa puggalassa ti attho. **bhaṭapathenā**³⁹ (Pj II 542,10) ti raññā dinnabhattamatena. **puṭṭho** (Pj II 542,10 vuttam !) ti posito āpādiko vaḍhiko ti attho. **etī** (Pj II 542, 12) ti gacchati. **idhā** (Sn 832c) ti mama santāne nesanti khīnāsavānam. **ye** (Sn 833a) ti ye atinto khīnāsavo⁴⁰. **carantī** (Sn 833a) ti viharanti. **diṭṭhihi** (Sn 833b) ti dvāsaṭṭhi diṭṭhihi. **paramam uggahitan** (Sn 833d⁴¹) ti idam paramam aggam setṭham ti uggahitam abhinivitṭham ajhositam. **kotthuādayo** (Pj II 542,24) ti sigālādayo.

*Pasūrasuttavaṇṇanādipani*⁴² samattā (Pj II 542,27).

ukkuṭikan (Pj II 544,1*) ti asampuṭṭhamajham. **anukaḍḍhitā** (Pj II 544,2*) ti pādanikkhepasamaye⁴³ pacchato añchitam. **sahasānupiṭitan**

³⁶ Ms. *puttā*.

³⁷ Ms. *unṇamanatī*.

³⁸ Dittography.

³⁹ Ms. °*mathena*.

⁴⁰ Read *atintā khīnāsavā?*

⁴¹ Cf. v.l. B^{ai} in E^c!

⁴² Ms. *Papura*°.

(Pj II 544,3*) *ti aggapādena panhiyā ca sahasā sannirumbhitam.* **vippakatā** (Pj II 544,5) *ti aniṭhitā. abhikāman* (Pj II 544,21) *ti mamañ icchantam idan* (Sn 835c = Pj II 544,23) *ti rūpam kā[ma] nāssā* (cf. Pj II 544,28?⁴⁴) *ti kā na assa. saccāni* (Pj II 545,9) *ti cattāri ariyasaccāni. vadatī* (⁴⁵) *ti māgañdiyam*⁴⁶ brāhmaṇo vadati. **purisabyatayan** (Pj II 545,23 °ttayam) *ti pathamapurisassa uttamaādesavasena purisavipalāsam* katvā. **dasavatthukam** **sammādiṭṭhin** (Pj II 545,26) *ti atthi dinnam* atthi yiṭṭham atthi hutam atthi sukatañ dukatānam vipāko atthi pitā atthi mātā atthi sattā opapātikā atthi ayam loko atthi paraloko atthi loke samañā brāhmaṇā ye imañ ca lokam parañ ca lokam abhijānitvā pavedenti vā evam dasavatthukasamādiṭṭhi. **navāṅgam** **savanam**⁴⁷ (Pj II 545,27) *ti tassā dasavatthukāya sammādiṭṭhiyā savanam. tesū* (Pj II 545,30) *ti dasavatthukasammādiṭṭhiādisu. atamayatāpajjanenā* (Pj II 545,34 °mm°) *ti nitañhabhāvam āpajjanena*⁴⁸. **yuttasaññan** (Pj II 546,16) *ti samañādhamme paṭiladdhasaññam. tassā* (Sn 842d = Pj II 546,24) *ti tassa mayham na hoti. paṭisamuyujjeyyā* (Sn 843d = Pj II 546,34⁴⁹) *ti paṭiyujjeyya*⁵⁰. **saman** (Sn 843c = Pj II 546,32) *ti samānam. rūpadhātvādī* (Pj II 547,1 rūpavathādī°) *ti ettha ādisaddena vedanāsaññāsañkhāradhātuyo samgañhāti. rūpanimittaniketādīni* (Pj II 547,2) *ettha ādisaddena saddagandharasapoṭṭhabbadhammanikete samgañhāti. puthubhūto* (Pj II 547,5) *ti visum bhūto. mutarūpādibhedāyā* (Pj II 547,24) *ti ettha mutam rūpanāma*⁵¹ *gandharasapoṭṭhabbāni ādisaddena sarasakhobhādayo samgañhāti. kāmādhikaraṇan* (Pj II 548,4) *ti*

⁴³ Ms. *pādapaṭicekkhapasamaye*, cf. *pādanikkhepasamaye kadḍhanto viya pādam nikkipati ten' assa padam anukadditam pacchato añchitam hoti*, Vism-mhṭ on Vism 105,4*

⁴⁴ E^o *kā nu assa dīṭṭhī*. The exact reference to Pj II remains uncertain.

⁴⁵ Reference in Pj II uncertain.

⁴⁶ Ms. has consistently *-ṇd-*.

⁴⁷ Ms. *na ca tam savanam!*

⁴⁸ Corrected from *āpajjanassa*.

⁴⁹ Cf. v.l. B^a in E^o.

⁵⁰ Ms. *paṭisamyu*°, *°sam*° cancelled.

⁵¹ Thus after correction from *nāmarūpa*°.

kāmahetukam. **dhammādhikaraṇan** (Pj II 548,5) ti diṭṭhidhamma-kāraṇam.

Māgaṇḍiyasuttavaṇṇanādīpanī samattā (Pj II 548,9)

uppattiyan (Pj II 548,14) ti sabhāvalakkhaṇe⁵² bhummam. **uttā** ti (Pj II 548,15 vuttā) vuttā va. **devatānaṁ cittaṁ nītvā** (Pj II 548,20) ti ruddhicaritadevatānam cittācāraṇ nītvā. *Sammāparibbājaniyasuttam* (Sn 359-375) hi rāgacaritānam devatānam bhagavā kathesi dosacaritānam *Kalaha<vi>vādasuttam* (Sn 862-877) mohacaritānam *Mahābyūhasuttam* (Sn 895-914) saddhācaritānam *Tuvaṭakapaṭipadam* (Sn 915-934 Tuvaṭakasutta) buddh<i>caritānam *Purābhedasuttam* (Sn 848-861) vitakkacaritānam *Cūlabyūhasuttam* (Sn 878-894) kathesi⁵³. **pucchāyā** (Pj II 548,24) ti pucchāgāthāya. **kathamḍassī** (Pj II 548,24) ti kīdisena dassanena samannāgato. **kathamṣilo** (Pj II 548,25) ti kīdi[va]sena sīlena samannāgato **upasanto** (Pj II 548,29) ti nibbuto[

The six *suttas* mentioned above are grouped together in the same way already in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*: Sv 682,18-23.

Freiburg i. Br.

Oskar von Hinüber

⁵² Ms. *yabāva*°.

⁵³ Cf. Pj II 548,12-14 and 361,26-28.

Buddhist Literature of Lān Nā on the History of Lān Nā's Buddhism¹

General Aspects of Lān Nā's Historical Literature

Lān Nā's numerous and fact-filled historical works consist of secular and religious writings, are written in Mon, Pāli or Thai Yuan languages with Mon, Thai (Fak Khām) or Tham letters, and can be short descriptions of one particular event or longer accounts through the ages.

Mon dominated the region from about A.D. 750 to 1300 when the Thai rose to power. The oldest surviving documents are Mon inscriptions on stone with dates shortly after 1200; a few undated inscriptions may be somewhat older.² The oldest Thai inscription with a date is from 1371 (Wat Phra Yün, Lamphūn)³ though here again some undated inscriptions may be older.⁴ The oldest Thai palmleaf manuscript with a date is part of a Jātaka book in Pāli from 1471.⁵ Inscriptions are the only true primary sources. Of other texts, which usually were written on palmleaf, we do not have the originals, only

¹ This article is a revised and enlarged version of the paper *Literature on the History of Local Buddhism*, presented at the 1st Conference on Buddhist Literature of Lān Nā, "A Survey of Present Knowledge and Suggestions for Future Activities", held at Wat Suan Dòk, Chiang Mai, 15-16 November 1994.

² Texts and translations for instance in: Halliday 1930 Inscriptions mōn.

³ Text and translation for instance in: Griswold / Prasöt 1974 Inscr. Wat Phra Yün.

⁴ See for instance: Penth 1988-89 Inscriptions and Images; Penth 1992 Thai Literacy.

⁵ v. Hintüber 1993 Pāli und Lānna: 223.

copies of copies. Thus, there are no original manuscripts of any of the chronicles. Climate and insects necessitated copying to preserve a text.

Lān Nā's authors wrote solely on their own history or, at the most, on the old history of Buddhism in India and Ceylon. The accent of their writings is mostly on one locality in Lān Nā or on one single item such as an image; other regions are mentioned mainly to show that a local item or feature was derived from there, or was moved to there. Lān Nā's authors did not write the history of other peoples, nor did they note down the customs of other peoples, whether these populations were living outside their area or within Lān Nā itself. Thus, for instance, there is no work on the history of the local Lawa, no description of them as a different people, and no old Lawa word list; there is no history, for instance, of China, of a neighbouring Burmese kingdom, nor of Sukhōthai, Ayuthayā. There is also no comprehensive history of Lān Nā. There are, it is true, some chronicles that deal with many places in and outside Lān Nā; but that is not because of wide historical interest on the part of the authors but because their subject, for instance the history of the Wat Suan Dòk monks and their school (MS), or the history of the Wat Pā Dāng school (JKM), or the history of Chiang Mai (CMA), necessitated dealing with other places. Nonetheless, in particular the last two chronicles are more broad-minded in outlook than others and could be read as Lān Nā histories with a strong accent on Chiang Mai. One can therefore state that Lān Nā's historical works are basically locality-centered or item-centered. In that, Lān Nā was not alone, most other regions in Southeast Asia had a similar self-centered way of writing only their own history; but it is clearly different from, for instance, old China or old Rome, where the history, languages and customs of other peoples received much attention.

If the authors of old have not left us an account of the Lawa who lived among them, neither have they left us an account of the life of the ordinary Mon or Thai person. The texts mostly enumerate events, political, military and religious, nearly always in neat chronological order. Causal connections are sometimes explained, are often obvious, occasionally not. Treating important events, the texts deal mostly with higher-ranking individuals, leaders of government, military, and clergy.

With the authors' interest limited to events in their own country, *mūang*, their own region, or their own monastery or school, their outlook was limited geographically. Their outlook was also limited intellectually in the sense that they did not compare; certainly they did not critically compare and evaluate in writing, though one imagines occasional lively discussions among learned monks. But in their writings, authors did not, for instance, compare their own people's history with the history of other populations in order to look for similarities or generalities, did not compare obviously similar accounts of several different famous Buddha statues as a starting point for an investigation into these similarities, did not compare conflicting evidence on one and the same subject for a study into the reason behind the difference. Since there was no comparing, there was no weighing or reasoned choosing between contradictory sources. It seems that there also was a complete absence of historical speculation or historical philosophy, for instance as to the meaning of history, or to its usefulness for present everyday life or for future generations. And they probably never abstracted, summarized a chain of related events. One can therefore further characterize Lān Nā's historical works as mostly plain, enumerative and descriptive, and her historians as mainly recorders and compilers.

However, that limited, enumerative event-descriptiveness is the very strongpoint of Lān Nā's historical literature. Authors did not

choose between two diverging sources but stated them both; they had the highest respect for the written word and did not lightly change, add to, or 'correct' what they found noted by their forefathers, an attitude at present still prevalent among the senior generation. Therefore, in spite of errors and sometimes accidental 'jumps' while copying which resulted in lacunae in the copied text, today's historian can with a good deal of confidence work with the material that has been handed down - if something appears unintelligible, there is a fair probability that he (or she) does not understand the matter properly, and not that the text is corrupt.

With regard to its historical qualities, Lān Nā's literature can roughly be divided into two categories: factual history and fictional or mythical, legendary history. This paper is meant to treat literature dealing with factual history. However, Lān Nā's factual history literature sometimes is not without legendary or mythical elements.

Buddhist Literature of Lān Nā on the History of Lān Nā's Buddhism

A major part of Lān Nā's historical literature was created by past local Mon and Thai authors who wrote on, or noted contemporary events of, the factual history of their religion in Lān Nā. These texts can be classed as Lān Nā's Buddhist literature dealing with the factual history of Lān Nā's Buddhism and can be divided into 6 groups:

1. General religion chronicles
2. Chronicles of Buddha images
3. Chronicles of religious sites
4. Inscriptions
5. Colophons
6. Other

The lists below are meant to be suggestions or examples only; they are neither complete nor perfect in all details. Some dates are tentative. Items with Pāli text are marked by an asterisk *.

1. General Religion Chronicles

± 1425 Buddhañāṇa begins *Mūlasāsanā* (MS).
 1516-17 * Ratanapañña writes the first part of *Jinakālamālī* (JKM). The second or last part ends with the year 1527.

2. Chronicles of Buddha Images

Ratanapañña in his JKM quite often mentions Buddha images and usually remarks on their history. Of some of the images, he reproduces their entire history. These accounts are among the earliest known versions of image chronicles.

Some images are not mentioned in JKM (for example: Phra Silā, Wat Chiang Man, Chiang Mai); possible explanations are: the images then were not yet in Chiang Mai; they were mentioned in sections lost from JKM;⁶ their chronicles were written after 1527.

The image Phra Kāo Khāo (Phra Setangka Manī, Wat Chiang Man, Chiang Mai) has a chronicle in Thai but not in Pāli.

Phra Kāo Mòrakot has at least one chronicle version in Laotian / Yuan, and three in Pāli.

⁶ All known JKM manuscripts have a total gap between 1455 and 1476. Also, they do not report on JKM's principal monastery, Wat Pā Dāng near Chiang Mai, between 1453 and 1516.

The Sāvatthī Sandalwood Image (Phra Kän Jan) originally seems to have had a chronicle in Thai which Ratanapañña was the first to translate into Pāli for his JKM under the name *Varacandanasāranidāna*.

±1410 * Bodhirāmsi composes (or translates from Thai) the chronicle of Phra Sing, *Sihingga(buddharūpa)nidāna* (SIN).

? An unknown author writes in Yuan dialect the chronicle of Phra Kän Jan (KJ), i.e. of the Sāvatthī Sandalwood Image.

±1500 * Brahmarājapañña writes a history of Phra Käo Mòrakot (Emerald Buddha), *Ratanabimbavamsa* (KM-B).

The following 4 chronicles are in Ratanapañña's JKM.

1516-17 * History of Phra Sing, *Sīhalapātimā* (SIN-JKM).

1516-17 * History of Phra Käo Mòrakot, *Ratanapātimā* (KM-JKM).

1516-17 * History of Phra Sikhī, *Sikhībuddha* (SIK-JKM).

1517-27 * History of Phra Kän Jan (Sāvatthī Sandalwood Image), *Candanapātimā*, *Candanabimba* (KJ-JKM).

±1575 * Ariyavamsa (was he a Yuan ?) writes a history of Phra Käo Mòrakot (Emerald Buddha), *Amarakaṭabuddharūpanidāna* (KM-A).

±1575 * Ariyavamsa (same as of KM-A) writes a history of Phra Bāng, *Adhabhāgabuddharūpanidāna* (PB). Written in Wiang Jan ?

1785 * Phra Mahā Phōtha Langkā orders to write the history of Phra Silā (SIL).

? An unknown author writes the history of the Buddha image Phra Setangka Manī (Setamgamaṇi, Phra Käo Khāo) (SET).

3. Chronicles of Religious Sites

These chronicles, of which there are plenty, often consist of a common myth: the Buddha comes and makes predictions, leaves a hair, leaves a footprint, etc. The myth frequently explains the name of the future religious site. Sometimes the myth is followed by genuine historical material which describes events that indeed took place. One could call these histories *myth-chronicles*. Their date of composition is mostly unknown. They probably did not have a definite author and a definite year of composition because they presumably developed orally during a long time and later were written up. Here are some examples:

1565 Composition of the chronicle of Wat Phra Thāt Hariphunchai (HAR).

1606 (or later) The HAR appendix is written.

1631-1812 Composition of the chronicle of Phra Thāt Dōi Tung (DT); but see also: inscription 1.4.3.2 Chiang Sän 1605.

Chronicles of religious sites can contain episodes which are more or less similar to stories contained in *Phra jao liap lōk* "The Lord (circum-)tours the World", also known as *Tamnān phra bāt phra thāt* "History (or: The Origins) of the Holy Footprints and Relics", collections of legendary travels of the Buddha through Lān Nā and environment among the four Thai peoples, Siamese, Yuan, Khün and Lü.⁷

⁷ There are numerous versions of greatly varying length and contents. A general edition would be most welcome. For a tentative classification of the various versions see: Penth (ed.) 1993 History of Phra Thāt Dōi Tung: 64. It seems that so far only a few isolated mss have been studied and occasionally been distributed in polycopied form ("semi-published"); for

4. Inscriptions

Inscriptions mostly deal with one specific event that took place at a certain time, for instance the erection of a building at a monastery or the founding of a Buddha statue.

While chronicles easily belong to the category 'literature', it is often difficult to decide whether a certain inscription is 'literature'. In a broad sense, all inscriptions, whether on stones, on Buddha images, on bells, etc., can be called 'literature' concerning the history of local Buddhism. This is particularly true for longer inscriptions which sometimes are well-phrased and parts of which are written in verse or rhyme. However, very short inscriptions can hardly be regarded as being genuine 'literature'. It will be up to the individual reader to decide where to draw the line. Here are a few examples.

1219 * Inscr. 1.3.1.1 Wat Dòn 1219; stone; Pāli and Mon languages.

1411 Inscr. 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411; stone; *kham ham* verse.

1470 * Inscr. 1.2.3.2 Wat Phra Jao Meng Rāi 1470; on a bronze 'Phra Sing' Buddha image.⁸

1477 * Inscr. 1.5.3.2 Wat Phayā Ruang 1477; on a bronze Buddha image.

instance: Sommāi 1967 Tamnān Müang Fāng. (Incidentally, the title of the ms is a misnomer because the ms is a *Phra jao liap lōk* text and does not deal with Fāng's history.)

⁸ 'Phra Sing' means a certain image but also a type of Buddha image in general. There are several images with inscriptions stating that it is a 'Phra Sing'. This statue is one of them. The 'real' Phra Sing, dealt with in SIN, is claimed to be an image either in Chiang Mai, Bangkok, or Nakhòn Sī Thamma Rāt; none of these three images is inscribed.

1605 Inscr. 1.4.3.2 Chiang Sän 1605; on a bronze image of a hermit (*rūstī*, ရရှိ). Contains the earliest known version of the Dōi Tung chronicle.

See below under 'INSCRIPTIONS' for their publication.

5. Colophons

Similar to inscriptions which record, for instance, the founding of an image and are laid down on the pedestal of the image, palmleaf manuscripts (on any subject) may have at the end of the text proper a post-script or colophon that is of general historical interest and that also often bears on the history of local Buddhism because it records details about the writing of the manuscript: author, copyist, sponsor, costs, date, place, circumstances, etc. Some colophons are very short and can hardly be called 'literature'; others are longer, highly informative and also well-written. Colophons are sometimes omitted by copyists, in text editions or translations (and overlooked by their readers).

While instructive colophons are relatively frequent, their opposite, viz. informative prologues, are rare.⁹

See below under 'COLOPHONS' for their publication.

6. Other

There are secular chronicles which have a definite religious accent in that they prominently report on religious activities, for

⁹ For instance: prologue to *Cāmadevīvāṃsa* by Bodhirāmsi, c.1410. In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 44 n.2; CDV.P+Y/T'1967: 1-2.

instance on construction work at monasteries. They are not 'Buddhist historical literature' in a strict sense but complement other Buddhist writings on the history of local Buddhism. To mention only one example:

± 1410 * Bodhiramsi translates from Thai *Cāmādevīvamsa* (CDV).

Finally must be mentioned certain secular chronicles and other historical writings which technically lie outside the field of 'Buddhist historical literature' yet are not unrelated: they can contain versions of old pieces of Buddhist historical writings, they deal occasionally with objects, events and persons connected with Buddhist writings on the past, and they therefore contribute to a better understanding of such writings. To mention only two well-known chronicles:

- ±1806 Completion of the 7-fascicle ('bundle') version of the Chronicle of Chiang Mai (CMA).
- ±1827 Completion of the 8-fascicle version of the Chronicle of Chiang Mai (CMA).
- ±1895 Composition of the Chronicle of Nān (NAN).

Texts and their Publications

Note on Abbreviations

In the list below, texts are arranged in alphabetical order while their publications are in chronological order.

The list avoids titles (prince, etc.) but personal rank-titles attached to such ranks as phra, luang, etc., have been retained and authors are listed under these because they usually are better known.¹⁰

The first letters, before the 'decimal point', indicate the name of a text; for instance: KM = the chronicle of Phra Kāo Mōrakot, i.e. the Emerald Buddha image.¹¹

If there are several text versions of the same story, a hyphen indicates the version; for instance: KM-A = history of Phra Kāo Mōrakot according to the thera Ariyavāmsa.

The letters after the 'decimal point' indicate the modern editor of the text, or the translator, by his initials; for instance: KM-A.CN = Translation of KM-A into French by Camille Notton.

It is sometimes useful or even necessary to indicate the language; for instance: SIN.SM/P and SIN.SM/T, meaning that the

¹⁰ Here are some frequently mentioned names and personal titles:
Chām Bunnāk = Phrayā Prachākit-kōrajak ชัม บุนนาค, พระยาปราชากจกรจักร

Kāo = Phrayā Thammaparōhit แก้ว, พระยาธรรมปิริหิต

Nōi = Phra Wichianprīchā น้อย, พระวิเชียรปิริชา

Phā Tālalaksamon = Luang Prasōt Aksōranit = Phrayā Pariyati-thamthādā แพ ตาลະสັກມະນັນ, หลวงปะເສີຖື ອັກນິຕີ, พระยาປິຍັຕິອຣມຮາດາ

Sitthi Lōjanānon = Phrayā Yānawijit ສີທີ ໂລຈະນານທ່າ, พระยา ญาณວິຈິຕ່

¹¹ If in future more texts are to be scrutinized, classified, etc., using the initials of two or three words in the title or name of a text will no longer be enough to clearly distinguish between different texts. One possible solution could be to follow the system of the Critical Pāli Dictionary and to use the first 5 letters of the name of a text instead; for instance: JKM = Jinak (Jinakālamālī), CDV = Cāmad (Cāmadēvīvāmsa), SIN = Sihīn (Sihīngā(buddharūpa)nidāna). That would work well for Pāli titles; but for the less uniform Yuan titles adaptations will be necessary.

chronicle of the Buddha image Phra Sing (SIN) was edited by Säng Monwithūn (SM) in Pāli (P) and also translated by him into Thai (T). Other abbreviations: E = English, F = French.

If the same text was repeatedly published, it can be useful to indicate the year of publication; for instance: KM-A.CN'1933.

Note on Text Editions and Transcriptions

In the case of inscriptions that are written in Mon, Pāli or Thai languages and archaic alphabets, also in the case of palmleaf manuscripts written in Pāli, text editions usually are in the form of a transcription that is an exact transliteration, letter by letter, (called คำจารึก, อักษรแปลง) from the original alphabet into Roman or Thai characters. This gives the modern reader a precise idea of the orthography used in the old text. These transliterations are frequently accompanied by a Modern Thai Reading (called คำอ่านปัจจุบัน) to facilitate understanding; here, modern orthography and explanatory footnotes are used to assist the reader.

But in the case of chronicles written in Yuan dialect and in Tham or Fak Khām letters, text editions practically always are liberal transpositions into modern Thai (called *pariwat* ปริวรรติ), i.e. a form of Modern Thai Reading. Here, modern and original orthography are mixed to produce a quickly readable modern version with old local flavour, the degree of mixture being individually decided by each editor. These transpositions do not permit reconstruction of the original orthography but only of the wording; they come close to translations.

CDV

Cāmādevīvaṃsa. A Pāli version of the history of Old Lamphūn, *History of Nāng Jām Thewī* (NJT), translated c.1410 from Thai

(Deyyabhāsā) into Pāli (bhāsā Paṭibyañjana akkhara) by the mahāthera Bodhirāmsi. The text has 15 chapters. The end of chapter 4 and the whole of chapters 5 and 6 are missing in all known manuscripts. Probably at an early date one or more bundles of a certain palmleaf manuscript were lost and all our presently known manuscripts go back to that one defective manuscript. Contents: From the visit and prophecy of the Buddha concerning the city until Ādittarāja (c. 1150).

CDV.PK

Translation of CDV into Thai by Phrayā Prachākit-kòrajak (Chām Bunnāk).

In: *Wachirayān*, 9, 1898-99.¹²

CDV.WL

Pāli text edition of CDV in modern Thai characters, probably prepared by officials in the Wachirayān National Library from an unspecified manuscript in that Library.

In: *Wachirayān* Library 1920 Cāmadevīvāṃsa.

CDV.P+Y

Translation of CDV.WL into Thai by Phrayā Pariyati-thamthādā and Phrayā Yānawijit.

In: *Wachirayān* Library 1920 Cāmadevīvāṃsa.

Fine Arts Dept 1967 Cāmadevīvāṃsa.

CMA

The Chronicle of Chiang Mai. The known 7-fascicle ('bundle') versions end in 1805/06 while the 8-fascicle versions end in 1827. The title

¹² The journal *Wachirayān* was published between 1884-1905 by the Royal Wachirayān Library, predecessor of the Wachirayān National Library, itself predecessor of the present National Library.

usually is *Tamnān Phün Müang Chiang Mai* ตำนานพื้นเมืองเชียงใหม่ “Historical Account of the Past of Chiang Mai” but for as yet unknown reasons some manuscripts have the title *Tamnān Sip-hā Rāchawong* ตำนาน 15 ราชวงศ์ “Historical Account of the 15 Reigns”.

CMA.CN

Translation of a 7-fascicle version of CMA into French by Camille Notton.

In: Notton 1930 *Annales* (3).

CMA.TT

Text edition of an 8-fascicle version of CMA in modern Thai by Thon Tonman.

In: Thon 1971 *Chronicle of Chiang Mai*.

COLOPHONS

Colophons to *Cāmadevīvāṇīsa* (Bodhirāmsi, c.1410)

In: Cœdès 1915 *Ouvrages palis*: 43 n.2.

CDV.P+Y'1967: at the end of each chapter.

Colophon to *Sihīṅganidāna* (Bodhirāmsi, c.1410)

In: Cœdès 1915 *Ouvrages palis*: 43 n.3.

Colophons to commentaries to *atṭhakathās* of *Buddhaghosa*

(Ñāṇakitti, c. 1495)

In: Cœdès 1915 *Ouvrages palis*: 40 n.3; 41 n.1-3.

Colophon to *KM* (*Brahmarājapañña*, c.1500)

In: Cœdès 1915 *Ouvrages palis*: 46 n.2.

Colophon to *Vessantaradīpanī* (*Sirimaṅgala*, 1517)

In: Cœdès 1915 *Ouvrages palis*: 41 n.4.

Colophon to *Saṅkhyapakāsaka-ṭīkā* (Sirimaṅgala, 1520)
In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 39 n.2.

Colophon to *Maṅgaladīpanī* (Sirimaṅgala, 1524)
In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 40 n.1.

Colophon to JKM (1527)

In: JKM.WL/P'1908: 187-188.

JKM.WL/T'1908: 250-151.

JKM.GC/P in Cœdès 1925 Documents: 4-5 n.1 (not at the end of
the JKM text!).

JKM.SM/T'1958: 152-153.

JKM.J/E'1968: 185-186.

Various other colophons and related observations are in:

v.Hinüber 1987 Pāli Manuscripts at the Siam Society.

Hundius 1990 Colophons of Thirty Pāli Manuscripts.

v.Hinüber 1990 On some Colophons.

v.Hinüber 1993 Pāli und Lānnā.

DT

The chronicle of the religious site Phra Thāt Dōi Tung, twin stūpas (jedī, cetiya) on a high hill overlooking the Chiang Sān plain, about 50 km north of Chiang Rāi.

DT.HP

Text edition of DT in modern Thai based on the manuscript from Wat Huai Khrai near Dōi Tung and collated with a greater number of other DT manuscripts and one inscription (see also below: Inscriptions).

In: Penth (ed.) 1993 History of Phra Thāt Dōi Tung.

HAR

The chronicle of Phra Thāt Hariphunchai, Lamphūn, written in Yuan characters and dialect. Contents: From the earliest existences of the Buddha to 1565, with an additional episode dated 1606.

HAR.FAD'1942

In: Fine Arts Dept 1942 Prachum Tamnān (1).

HAR.FAD'1962

Text edition of HAR in modern Thai, based on the manuscript 'Phāyap letters' อักษรไทยพ้ายพ no.21 of the National Library, Bangkok.

In: Fine Arts Dept. 1962 Tamnān Phra Thāt Hariphunchai.

HAR.SW

Text edition of HAR in modern Thai by Singkha Wannasai, based on several manuscripts and earlier text editions.

In: Singkha 1973 Tamnān Phra Thāt Hariphunchai.

- Several times reprinted by Wat Phra Thāt Hariphunchai as a part of other publications of the monastery, for instance in 1974 and 1987.

INSCRIPTIONS**1.2.3.2 Wat Phra Jao Meng Rāi 1470**

In: Griswold 1957 Dated Buddha Images: no.1.

Penth 1976 Jāruk phra Phuttha rūp: no.2.

1.3.1.1 Wat Dòn 1219

In: Coëdès 1915 Documents: 189-192.

Halliday 1930 Inscriptions mōn: 87-90 (does not contain the Pāli text).

Jampā et al. c.1990 Wikhrò: 88-101.

1.4.3.2 Dòi Tung 1605

In: Penth et al. 1993 Inscr. 1.4.3.2 Chiang Sän 1605.¹³

1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411

In: Thöm / Prasān 1980 Silā Jāruk Kasat Lò Phò./9.

1.5.3.2 Wat Phayā Ruang 1477

In: Griswold 1963 Yudhiṣṭhīra: 226-27.

Sinchai / Jintanā 1974 Aksòn nüa: 107 (only the Pāli text).

Thöm / Bunlöt 1987 Jāruk Yuthisathira.

JKM

The chronicle *Jinakālamālī* (or *Jinakālamālinī*). Written in Pāli, the chronicle traces the history of Buddhism from India and Ceylon to Lān Nā. It deals specifically with a new local school, the Sīhaṭabhiikkhus who installed themselves in 1430 in Wat Pā Dāng near Chiang Mai, then records in detail the activities of the Wat Pā Dāng monks first until 1517, and finally for another 10 years until 1527. The author (at least of the first part, up to 1517) was Ratanapaññā, writing in Wat Pā Dāng.

There is an explanatory index to the Thailand part of the chronicle with comments on places, objects and events: Penth 1994 JKM Index. Cf. ibid. p.335-342 for details of JKM manuscripts and text editions.

¹³ It has since been established that the inscribed object (a bronze statue of a hermit) originally was kept on Dòi Tung, hence the change in name of the inscription in the Archive of Lān Nā Inscriptions.

JKM.WL/P

Pāli text edition of JKM in Thai letters arranged by the Royal Wachirayān Library.

In: Wachirayān Library 1908 Jinakālamālī (1). ('Prince Damrong Edition').

JKM.WL/T

Translation of JKM.WL/P into Thai by Phrayā Phojanāphimon and others, made in 1794, omitting certain difficult passages.

In: Wachirayān Library 1908 Jinakālamālī (2).

JKM.GC/P

Pāli text edition of JKM (only the Thailand part) in Roman letters by George Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 4-5; 36-72.

JKM.GC/F

Translation of JKM.GC/P (only the Thailand part of the chronicle) into French by George Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 5; 73-140.

JKM.SM

Translation of JKM into modern Thai by Säng Monwithūn.

In: Säng 1958 Jinakālamālī; the Thailand part of the chronicle is on p. 81-153.

Säng 1967 Jinakālamālī; the Thailand part of the chronicle is on p. 90-171.

JKM.NJ

Translation of JKM into English by N.A.Jayawickrama.

In: Jayawickrama 1968 The Sheaf of Garlands; the Thailand part of the chronicle is on p. 96-186.

KJ

History of the Buddha image Phra Jao Kän Jan (Sandalwood Buddha Image). There were two of them: one made in Sāvatthī, and one in Chiang Sän (see JKM). KJ deals with the Sāvatthī image and calls the story *Varacandanasāranidāna*. But no Pāli text of that name seems to exist, the known manuscripts are in Thai Yuan and are usually called Tamnān Phra (Jao) Kän Jan. Ratanapañña presumably translated a Thai version into Pāli for his Jinakālamālī.

KJ-JKM

An account in Pāli of KJ in the second part (1517-27) of the chronicle Jinakālamālī.

KJ.PY

An account of KJ by Phrayā Prachākit-kòrajak in his Phongsāwadān Yōnok, presumably based on several Yuan manuscripts.

In: Prachākit 1907 Phongsāwadān Yōnok: 250-252.

KJ-JKM.GC/P

Pāli text edition of KJ-JKM in roman letters by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 69-70.

KJ-JKM.GC/F

Translation of the Pāli text of KJ-JKM into French by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 135-37.

KJ-JKM.NJ

Translation of KJ-JKM into English by N.A. Jayawickrama.

In: Jayawickrama 1968 The Sheaf of Garlands: 178-180.

KJ-JKM.SM

Translation of KJ-JKM into Thai by Säng Monwithūn.

In: Säng 1958 *Jinakālamālī*: 145-147.

Säng 1967 *Jinakālamālī*: 163-166.

KJ.SC

An account of KJ in modern Thai by Sanguan Chōtisukharat.

In: Sanguan 1972 *Prachum Tamnān* (2): 68-88. English abstract in Penth 1994 JKM Index: 324-326.

KM

Chronicle of the Buddha image Phra Kāo Mōrakot (Emerald Buddha). There are 3 Pāli versions by 3 different authors, Ariyavaṇsa (KM-A), Brahmarājapañña (KM-B), and Ratanapañña in his *Jinakālamālī* (KM-JKM). They probably did not copy from each other but rather used common Thai sources which Brahmarājapañña calls “Siamese language” (*syāmabhāsā*) in the colophon and which, in the case of Ariyavaṇsa, presumably in part is taken from a chapter of the Chronicle of Lān Chāng.¹⁴

There are also reports of Laotian versions in Luang Phra Bāng, one of which is well-known in Thailand (KM-LP), and I have heard and read of (but not seen) Yuan manuscripts in north Thailand.

KM-A

History of the Emerald Buddha according to Ariyavaṇsa: *Amarakaṭabuddharūpanidāna*. - Contents: From the creation of the image, initiated in 44 B.C. by the thera Nāgasena of Pāṭaliputta and sculpted by the god Vissukamma, to the death of King Jaya Jetṭha in

¹⁴ See also: Cœdès 1915 *Ouvrages palis*: 46; Lingat 1932 Rev. Notton 1932 *Emerald Buddha*; Lingat 1935 *Le culte*.

1571 when the image is in Wiang Jan. - Date and place of composition are not clear. Two likely dates may be 1643 and 1725; the chronicle perhaps was written at Wiang Jan. The Pāli text may not yet have been published.

KM-A.X

Translation of KM.A into modern Thai by an unnamed (?) person. - Contents: From Nāgasena to 1565 (correct: 1571 ?), when the image is in Wiang Jan, with a jump to 1778-80 when the image is removed to Bangkok.

In: Julalongkòn 1920 Phra Rācha Karanyānusòn: 81-105.

Julalongkòn 1964 Phra Rācha Karanyānusòn: 107-136.

KM-A.CN

Translation of KM-A from a Pāli - Yuan nissaya into English by Camille Notton. The Yuan text seems to have had enlargements over the Pāli text of the *Amarakaṭabuddharūpanidāna*.

In: Notton 1932 Emerald Buddha.

Notton 1933 Emerald Buddha.

KM.B

History of the Phra Kāo Mōrakot as told by Brahmarājapañña. The author translates old Thai texts into Pāli and calls his work *Ratanabimbavamsa*. - Contents: From the creation of the image by Nāgasena until the image is in Lampāng. - Date and place of composition are indicated in the text but have not yet been identified.

KM-B.TP

Translation of KM-B into modern Thai by Phrayā Thammaparōhit. Finished in 1788, printed in 1937.

In: ... (No details available to me).

KM-B.PA/P

Pāli text edition of KM-B in modern Thai letters probably by Luang Prasöt Aksòranit.

In: Wachirayān Library 1912 Ratanaphimphawong.

KM-B.PA/T

Translation of KM-B into modern Thai by Luang Prasöt Aksòranit.

Probably in: Wachirayān Library 1912 Ratanaphimphawong.

KM-B.SM

Translation of KM.B into modern Thai by Säng Monwithūn, occasionally with Pāli passages.

In: Säng 1967 Ratanaphimphawong.

KM-JKM

History of the Phra Kāo Mòrakot according to Ratanapañña, 1516-17, in his Jinakālamālī. The story ends in 1481, when the image is installed in the Jedī Luang, Chiang Mai.

KM-JKM.GC/P

Pāli text edition of KM-JKM in roman letters by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 53-56.

KM-JKM.GC/F

Translation of KM-JKM into French by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 112-115.

KM-JKM.SM

Translation of KM-JKM into Thai by Säng Monwithūn.

In: Säng 1958 Jinakālamālī: 114-118.

Säng 1967 Jinakālamālī: 128-133.

KM-JKM.NJ

Translation of KM-JKM into English by N.A. Jayawickrama.
In: Jayawickrama 1968 *The Sheaf of Garlands*: 141-145.

KM-LP

Text edition (?) of KM in modern Thai, based on a Laotian version from Luang Phra Bāng.

In: Wichianprīchā 1869 *Phongsāwadān Nüa*: Appendix.

Wichianprīchā 1894 *Phongsāwadān Nüa*: Appendix (reprint of the 1869 edition).

Prachum *Phongsāwadān*, 1, 1914, 79-112 (reprint of the 1894 PN and KM texts).

Prachum *Phongsāwadān*, 1, 1963, 79-112 (reprint by Kāo Nā Publishers).

- The KM printings of 1869 and 1894 have the title *Tamnān Phra Kāo Mòrakot Luang Phra Bāng*, but in Prachum *Phongsāwadān* the title is shortened to *Tamnān Phra Kāo Mòrakot*.

KM.PY

An account of KM by Phrayā Prachākit-kòrajak in his *Phongsāwadān Yōnok*, presumably based on several Yuan manuscripts.

In: Prachākit 1907 *Phongsāwadān Yōnok*: 246-248.

KM.SC

An account of KM in modern Thai by Sanguan Chōtisukharat.

In: Sanguan 1972 *Prachum Tamnān* (2): 1-35.

MS

Mūlasāsanā. A chronicle of Buddhism and related secular events in India, Sri Lanka and Thailand, with emphasis on Lān Nā and the arāññavāsī monks of Wat Suan Dòk near Chiang Mai. Contents: From the beginning of Buddhism in India to its advent in central and north

Thailand, on to the founding of Wat Suan Dòk in 1371 and up to about 1510. In a way, MS is a chronicle of Wat Suan Dòk as JKM is a chronicle of Wat Pā Däng. But MS is much less scholarly and thus probably mirrors a basic difference between the two *araññavāsī* sects. All known versions of MS are written in Tham letters and Yuan dialect and are rather uniform. MS as it is known today is the result of an original version with later additions: it seems that the abbot of Wat Suan Dòk, Buddhañāṇa, composed the first part in around 1425 and that later the abbot Buddhabukāma (whose identity is not clear)¹⁵ and perhaps others continued it.

MS.S+P

Text edition of MS in modern Thai by Sut Sīsomwong and Phrom Khamālā, based on a manuscript in the Bangkok National Library.

In: Sut/Phrom 1939 *Mūlasāsanā*.

Sut/Phrom 1970 *Mūlasāsanā*.

MS.PN

Text edition of MS in modern Thai by Prasöt na Nakhòn (Prasert na Nagarā), based on MS.S+P and collated with other MS manuscripts.

In: Prasöt 1975 *Mūlasāsanā*.

NAN

The Chronicle of Nān.

NAN.RS

Text edition of NAN in modern Thai by Sān Luang Rācha Somphān แสงหลวง ราชสมภาร, based on one or several Yuan manuscripts. - The prince of Nān, Suriyaphong Phritadet ສ්‍රියພ්‍රංග්‍රහිතදේශ, ordered it

¹⁵ Griswold / Prasöt 1972 King Lödaiya: 53-54; Prasöt 1975 *Mūlasāsanā*: 286 n.1.

compiled in 1894 after his accession. The last date mentioned is 1894. Though there were, and perhaps still exist, older versions written or copied in the years after 1800, it is this version which is generally used today.

In: Rācha Somphān 1919 Nān History.

NAN.P+W

An abridged translation of Part 2 and the first two sections of Part 3 of NAN.RS into English by Prasoet Churatana, checked and edited by David Wyatt.

In: Prasöt/Wyatt 1966 Nān Chronicle.

NAN.W

Translation of NAN into English by David Wyatt.

In: Wyatt 1994 Nān Chronicle.

NJT

History of Nāng Jām Thewī. Contents: The Buddha visits the future site of Lamphūn (Hariphunchai) and makes prophecies; followed by a short biography of queen Jām Thewī; followed by a relation of events in Lamphūn up to the last Mon king of the city, Yībā, when the Thai Yuan king, Mang Rāi, conquers the city. Dates are few and unreliable.

Mahāthera Bodhirāmsi translated the original Thai text (which at least for its earlier part would have been derived from old Mon texts, oral or written) into Pāli in about 1410 under the name of *Cāmadevīvāṃsa* (CDV). Since then, there are 2 lines of text tradition: the old Thai line (History of Nāng Jām Thewī, NJT) and the new Pāli line (*Cāmadevīvāṃsa*, CDV). The CDV has been re-translated into modern Thai; it differs somewhat from the known versions of NJT, perhaps because NJT evolved more during the time than CDV.

NJT.AP

Translation of NJT from a Laotian manuscript in Luang Phra Bāng dated A.D.1646 into French by Auguste Pavie and assistants. There is an appendix with a list of Chiang Mai rulers from Mang Rāi to Fā Sawāthī.

In: Pavie 1898 *Etudes diverses* (2): 145 - 166 ('*Histoire de Nang Kiam Tévi*').

NJT.CN-Ams

Translation of NJT from a Yuan palmleaf manuscript which is not described (here called "manuscript A") into French by Camille Notton.

In: Notton 1930 *Annales* (2): 1-58.

NJT.CN-Bms

Translation of NJT from a Yuan palmleaf manuscript which is not described (here called "manuscript B") into French by Camille Notton. The translation covers only the story of Nāng Jām Thewī in a condensed way.

In: Notton 1930 *Annales* (2): 58-60.

SET

History of the Buddha image Phra (Kāo) Setangka Manī (Setaṅgamaṇī; in Wat Chiang Man, Chiang Mai), or Phra Kāo Khāo. Only in Yuan dialect, no Pāli version is known. - The history of the image is also mentioned in NJT.CN-Ams: 1-3. There is often confusion in texts between Phra Kāo Mōrakot, Phra Kāo Khāo, and Phra Setangka Mani.

SET.PY

Summary of SET by Phrayā Prachākit-kòrajak in his *Phongsāwadān Yōnok*, presumably based on a number of Yuan manuscripts.

In: Prachākit 1907 *Phongsāwadān Yōnok*: 244-245.

SET.EH

Summary of SET by E.W.Hutchinson, based on a transcription from Yuan into Thai made by the monk Phra Mahā Mün of Wat Hò Tham, Chiang Mai. That transcription was based on Mahā Mün's palmleaf manuscript which itself had been copied in 1920 at Wat Rampōng from another manuscript.

In: Hutchinson 1935 Sacred Images.

Hutchinson 1954 Sacred Images: 55-58.

SET.CN

Translation of SET from a manuscript in Yuan dialect (and probably in Tham letters) into French by Camille Notton.

In: Notton 1936 Phra Setangka Manī.

SIK

History of the Buddha image Phra Sikhī, one of the five Ayuthayā Black Stone Images, made from a black rock on which the Buddha once had rested near Ayuthayā. The image was originally presented to Angkor Thom, then to Pagan, to Lampāng (until 1515) from where it was forcefully removed to Ayuthayā.

SIK-JKM

Ratanapañña's version of SIK in the first part (1516-17) of his chronicle Jinakālamālī.

SIK-JKM.GC/P

Pāli text edition of SIK-JKM by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 60-61.

SIK-JKM.GC/F

Translation of SIK-JKM from Pāli into French by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 123-125.

SIK-JKM.SM

Translation of SIK-JKM from Pāli into Thai by Sāng Monwithūn.

In: Sāng 1958 *Jinakālamālī*: 125-128.

Sāng 1967 *Jinakālamālī*: 141-144.

SIK-JKM.NJ

Translation of SIK-JKM from Pāli into English by N.A. Jayawickrama.

In: Jayawickrama 1968 *The Sheaf of Garlands*: 155-158.

SIL

History of the Buddha Image Phra Silā at Wat Chiang Man, Chiang Mai, perhaps written in 1785 at Pā Sāng at the request of Phra Mahā Phōtha Langkā; there seem to be Pāli and Yuan versions. - Contents: King Ajātaśatru of Magadha (today: Bihār, north India) orders to make the image. It is later removed to Langkā, Burma, Sawankalōk, Lampāng, Chiang Mai. - The shape of the letters of the inscription around the head of the image (Ye dhammā ...) and the style of the image suggest that it was made soon after 900 in Bihār.¹⁶

SIL.EH

A (shortened ?) translation of SIL from Yuan into English by E.W.Hutchinson, based on a Yuan version made by the monk Phra Mahā Mün of Wat Hò Tham, Chiang Mai. Phra Mahā Mün had translated the Yuan version himself from a Pāli version and had put both side by side in his own manuscript.

In: Hutchinson 1935 *Sacred Images*.

Hutchinson 1954 *Sacred Images*: 59-62, 70-73.

¹⁶ Lohuizen 1961 *Stone Buddha*.

SIL.X

An account of SIL in modern Thai by an unnamed person, published by Wat Chiang Man in 1956.

In: Wat Chiang Man 1956 Tamnān Phra Silā.

SIL.SC

An account of SIL in modern Thai by Sanguan Chōtisukharat.

In: Sanguan 1972 Prachum Tamnān (2): 54-67.

SIN

History of the Buddha image Phra Sing (Phra Sihing, Phra Phuttha Sihing). Composed in Pāli or translated from Thai into Pāli c.1410 by the mahāthera Bodhirāmsi under the title *Sihīṅga(buddharūpa)nidāna*. The history of the image is also told by Ratanapañña in the first part (1516-17) of his chronicle Jinakālamālī (SIN-JKM). - This history has repeatedly been printed in various forms; below are listed only some examples. More are listed in Säng 1963 Tamnān Phra Sing: 80.

SIN.PA/P**SIN.PA/T**

Pāli text edition together with a translation of SIN into modern Thai by Luang Prasöt Aksoranit. Published under Prince Damrong in 1913 for a private printing made by the Royal Historical Research Society (Porāṇagatisamosara)¹⁷ or the Wachirayān Library (Hò Phra Samut)¹⁸.

In: Wachirayān Library 1913 Tamnān Phra Sing.

Wachirayān Library 1918 Tamnān Phra Sing.

SIN.CN

Translation of SIN.PA/T into English by Camille Nottou.

In: Nottou 1933 Phra Sing.

¹⁷ Cœdès 1915 *Ouvrages palis*: 43, n.3.

¹⁸ Thanit Yūphō in: Säng 1963 Nithān Phra Sing: Preface.

SIN.SM/P

Pāli text edition of SIN in modern Thai characters by Säng Monwithūn.

In: Säng 1963 *Nithān Phra Sing.*

SIN.SM/T

Translation of SIN.SM/P into Thai by Säng Monwithūn.

In: Säng 1963 *Nithān Phra Sing.*

SIN.SC

An account of SIN in modern Thai by Sanguan Chōtisukharat.

In: Sanguan 1972 *Prachum Tamnān* (2): 36-52.

SIN-JKM

Ratanapañña's version of SIN in his chronicle *Jinakālamālī*.

SIN-JKM.GC/P

Pāli text edition of SIN-JKM by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 *Documents*: 46-48.

SIN-JKM.GC/F

Translation of SIN-JKM from Pāli into French by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 *Documents*: 97-102.

SIN-JKM.SM

Translation of SIN-JKM from Pāli into Thai by Säng Monwithūn.

In: Säng 1958 *Jinakālamālī*: 100-105.

Reprinted in 1967: p.112-118

SIN-JKM.NJ

Translation of SIN-JKM from Pāli into English by N.A. Jayawickrama.

In: Jayawickrama 1968 *The Sheaf of Garlands*: 120-126.

Bibliography

Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis

G. Cœdès: Note sur les ouvrages palis composés en pays thaï. BEFEO, 15.3, 1915, 39-46.

Cœdès 1925 Documents

G. Cœdès: Documents sur l'histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental. BEFEO, 25, 1925, p.1-200.

Fine Arts Dept 1942 Prachum Tamnān (1)

กรมศิลปากร “ประชุมตាំងនພរទាតុ ភាគទី ១” ក្រុងពេទា 2485.

Fine Arts Dept. 1962 Tamnān Phra Thāt Hariphunchai

กรมศิลปากร “តាំងនພរទាតុវិរីរុញ្ញី ឧបនុខែសុទ្ធផំខាតិ” ក្រុងពេទា 2505.

Fine Arts Dept 1967 Cāmadevīvaṃsa

กรมศิลปากร “គោប់ល ចាមពូរធម៌ ពងគារមើំងិវិរីរុញ្ញី” ម៉ែនី 2510.

• Partial reprint of Wachirayān Library 1920 Cāmadevīvaṃsa. Does not contain the Pāli text, only the Preface by Prince Damrong and the Thai translation CDV.P+Y/T.

Griswold 1957 Dated Buddha Images

A.B. Griswold: Dated Buddha Images of Northern Siam. Ascona 1957.

Griswold 1963 Yudhiṣṭhira

A.B. Griswold: Prince Yudhiṣṭhira. Artibus Asiae, 26.3-4, 1963, 215-229.

Griswold / Prasöt 1972 King Lödaiya

A.B. Griswold / Prasert na Nagara: King Lödaiya and his Contemporaries. JSS, 60.1, 1972, 21-152.

Griswold / Prasöt 1974 Inscr. Wat Phra Yün

A.B. Griswold / Prasert na Nagara: The Inscription of Wat Phra Yün. JSS, 62.1, 1974, 123-141.

Halliday 1930 Inscriptions môn

R. Halliday: Les inscriptions môn du Siam. BEFEO, 30.1-2, 1930, 81-105.

v. Hinüber 1987 Pāli Manuscripts at the Siam Society

Oskar von Hinüber: The Pāli Manuscripts kept at the Siam Society, Bangkok. A short Catalogue. JSS, 75, 1987 p.9-74.

v. Hinüber 1990 On some Colophons

Oskar von Hinüber: On some Colophons of Old Lanna Pāli Manuscripts. Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Thai Studies, 11-13 May 1990, Kunming 1990, Vol. IV, 56-77.

v. Hinüber 1993 Pāli und Lānnā

Oskar v. Hinüber: Pāli und Lānnā (Nord-Thai) in den Kolophonen alter Palmbatthandschriften aus Nord-Thailand. In: Gerhard Meiser: Indogermanica et Italica. Festschrift für Helmut Rix. Innsbruck, 1993, 223-236.

Hundius 1990 Colophons of Thirty Pāli Manuscripts

Harald Hundius: The Colophons of Thirty Pāli Manuscripts From Northern Thailand. JPTS, 14, 1990, 1-173.

Hutchinson 1935 Sacred Images

E.W. Hutchinson: Sacred Images in Chiangmai. JSS, 28.2, 1935, 115-143.

Hutchinson 1954 Sacred Images

E.W. Hutchinson: Sacred Images in Chiangmai. In: Siam Society 1954 Fiftieth Anniversary (2): 54-73.

• Reprint of Hutchinson 1935 Images.

Jampā et al. c.1990 Wikhrò

จำปา เยื้องเจริญ / เทิม มีเต็ม / คงเดช ประพัฒน์ทอง “วิเคราะห์ศิลารีกในพิพิธภัณฑสถานแห่งชาติ หริภุญชัย” กรุงเทพฯ กรมศิลปากร พิมพ์ครั้งที่ 2 (ประจำ พ.ศ.2533).

Jayawickrama 1968 The Sheaf of Garlands

N.A. Jayawickrama: The Sheaf of Garlands of the Epochs of the Conqueror, Being a Translation of *Jinakālamālīpakaraṇam* of Ratanapañña Thera of Thailand. London, 1968.

Julalongkòn 1920 Phra Rācha Karanyānusòn

“พระราชกรณายานุสร พระราชนิพนธ์ในรัชกาลที่ 5 ตอนว่าด้วย พระราชนิพิธ์ศรี สัจปานกາ” กรุงเทพฯ หอพระสมุดวชิรญาณ ร.ศ. 2463.

Julalongkòn 1964 Phra Rācha Karanyānusòn

พระบาทสมเด็จพระจุลจอมเกล้าเจ้าอยู่หัว “พระราชกรณายานุสร” กรุงเทพฯ สำนักพิมพ์คลังวิทยา 2463 • Second printing of Julalongkòn 1920 Phra Rācha Karanyānusòn.

Lingat 1932 Rev. Notton 1932 Emerald Buddha

R. Lingat (reviews): Camille Notton: The Chronicle of the Emerald Buddha. Bangkok 1932. BEFEO, 32, 1932, 526-530.

Lingat 1935 Le culte

R. Lingat: Le culte du Bouddha d'Emeraude. JSS, 27.1, 1935, 9-38.

• Contains an analysis of the sources and the history of the Emerald Buddha, Phra Kāo Mōrakot.

Lohuizen 1961 Stone Buddha

J.E. van Lohuizen - de Leeuw: The “Stone Buddha” of Chiengmai and Its Inscription. Artibus Asiae, 24.3-4, 1961, 324-329.

Notton 1930 Annales (2)

Camille Notton: Annales du Siam, 2e volume, Chronique de Lap'un - Histoire de la dynastie Cham't'évi. Paris, 1930.

Notton 1930 Annales (3)

Camille Notton: Annales du Siam, 3e volume: Chronique de Xieng Mai. Paris 1932.

Notton 1932 Emerald Buddha

Camille Notton: The Chronicle of the Emerald Buddha. Bangkok, 1932.

Notton 1933 Emerald Buddha

Camille Notton: The Chronicle of the Emerald Buddha. Bangkok, 1933, Second Impression.

Notton 1933 Phra Sing

Camille Notton: P'ra Buddha Sihīṅga. Bangkok, 1933.

Pavie 1898 Etudes diverses (2)

Auguste Pavie: Mission Pavie. Etudes diverses (2): Recherches sur l'histoire du Cambodge, du Laos et du Siam. Paris, 1898.

Penth 1976 Jārük phra Phuttha rūp

ขันส์ เพนธ์ “คำจำกัดที่ฐานพระพุทธรูปในนครเชียงใหม่” กรุงเทพฯ สำนักนายก รัฐมนตรี 2519.

Penth 1988-89 Inscriptions and Images

Hans Penth: Inscriptions and Images on the Phra Mahā Thāt in Lamphūn. *Artibus Asiae*, 49.3-4, 351-369.

Penth 1992 Thai Literacy

Hans Penth: Thai Literacy. *Bulletin of the Archive of Lan Na Inscriptions*, 4, 1992, 19-112.

Penth (ed.) 1993 History of Phra Thāt Dōi Tung

ขันส์ เพนธ์ (บรรณาธิการ, บรรณาเพ็ญ เครื่อไทย และ ศรีเลา เกษพรหม ผู้ช่วยบรรณาธิการ): คณะกรรมการค้นคว้าวิจัยประวัติพระธาตุดอยตุง (รวม) “ประวัติพระธาตุดอยตุง” กรุงเทพฯ (ธนาคารไทยพาณิชย์) 2536. Contains the editor's Preface in Thai and English.

Penth et al. 1993 Inscr. 1.4.3.2 Chiang Sän 1605

ขันส์ เพนธ์ / บรรณาเพ็ญ เครื่อไทย / ศรีเลา เกษพรหม “จารึก 1.4.3.2 เชียงแสน พ.ศ.2147 / A.D.1605” จุลสารคลังข้อมูลจารึกล้านนา, 5, 2536/1993, 65-81.

Penth 1994 JKM Index

Hans Penth: *Jinakālamālī Index. An annotated Index to the Thailand Part of Ratanapañña's Chronicle Jinakālamālī*. The Pali Text Society, Oxford / Silkworm Books, Chiang Mai, 1994.

Prachākit 1907 Phongsāwadān Yōnok

พระยาประชากิจกรจักร “เรื่องพงษ์ชาวดารโยนก” กรุงเทพฯ ร.ศ. ๑๙๖.

Prasöt / Wyatt 1966 Nān Chronicle

Prasoet Churatana / David K. Wyatt: *The Nan Chronicle*. Ithaca, Cornell University, 1966.

Prasöt 1975 Mūlasāsanā

ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “ตำนานมูลศาสนา” กรุงเทพฯ 2518.

Rācha Somphān 1919 Nān History

แสนหลวงราชสมภพ “เรื่องราชวงศ์คปกรณ์” ใน ประชุมพงศาวดาร, 10, 2462.

Rācha Somphān 1964 Nān History

แสนหลวงราชสมภพ “เรื่องราชวงศ์คปกรณ์” ใน ประชุมพงศาวดาร ฉบับ หอสมุดแห่งชาติ, 10, 2507.

- Reprint of the 1919 edition by Kāo Nā Publishers สำนักพิมพ์ก้าวหน้า, เล่ม ๔.

Sāng 1958 Jinakālamālī

แสง มนวิท “ชินกามาลีปกรณ์” กรุงเทพฯ กรมศิลปากร 2501.

Sāng 1963 Nithān Phra Sing

แสง มนวิท “นิทานพราหมลสิหิงค์” กรุงเทพฯ กรมศิลปากร 2506.

Sāng 1967 Jinakālamālī

แสง มนวิท “ชินกามาลีปกรณ์” เชียงใหม่ กรมศิลปากร 2501.

- Reprint of Sāng 1958 Jinakālamālī

Sāng 1967 Ratanaphimphawong

แสง มนวิท “รัตนพิมพวงศ์ ตำนานพระแก้วมรกต พระกิจมุพรหมราชปัญญา แต่งเป็นภาษาบาลี” กรุงเทพฯ 2510.

Säng 1980 Buddhism

Saeng Chandragnaam (ed.): *Buddhism in Northern Thailand*. Chiang Mai, 1980. (Published on the occasion of "The 13th Conference of the World Fellowship of Buddhists, 24-29 November 1980 at Chiang Mai").

Sanguan 1972 Prachum Tamnān

สงาน โขตสุขรัตน์ “ประชุมต้านทานล้านนาไทย” กรุงเทพฯ 2515 (2 เล่ม).

Siam Society 1954 Fiftieth Anniversary

The Siam Society: The Siam Society fiftieth Anniversary Commemorative Publication. Selected Articles from The Siam Society Journal. Bangkok, 1954, 2 vols.

Sinchai / Jintanā 1974 Aksòn nüa

สินชัย กระบวนการ / จินตนา ตรีสุวรรณ “อักษรไทยภาคเหนือ” กรุงเทพฯ กรมการฝึกหัดครู 2517.

Singkha 1973 Tamnān Phra Thāt Hariphunchai

สิงหนา วรรณสัญ “ต้านทานพระธาตุหริภุญชัย” ลำพูน 2516.

- Several times reprinted by Wat Phra Thāt Hariphunchai as a part of other publications of the monastery, for instance in 1974 and 1987.

Sommāi 1976 Tamnān Müang Fāng¹⁹

สมหมาย เพรเมจิต “ต้านnan เมือง ฝาง” คณะสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัย เชียงใหม่ ๒๕๑๗ (ภาคบริหารล้ำดับที่ ๑๒) / Sommai Premchit: Muang Fang Chronicle, Faculty of Social Sciences, Chiang Mai University, 1976, 42 pp.

Sut / Phrom 1939 Mūlasāsanā

สุต ศรีสมวงศ์ / พรหน ขมาลา “ต้านnanมูลศาสนา” กรุงเทพฯ กรมศิลปากร 2482.

¹⁹ For this misnamed ms, which actually contains another text, see above footnote 3.

Sut / Phrom 1970 Mūlasāsanā

สุด ศรีสมวงศ์ / พรหม ชมาลา “ต้านานมูลศาสนा” กรุงเทพฯ / เชียงใหม่ กรรมศิลปกร 2513.

- Reprint of Sut / Phrom 1939 Mūlasāsanā.

Thöm / Prasān 1980 Silā Jāruk Kasat Lò Phò./9

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคง “ศิลปารักษ์ราชวงศ์มังราย ลพ./9” ศิลปกร, 24.2, 2523, 85-88.

Thöm / Bunlöt 1987 Jāruk Yuthisathira

เทิม มีเต็ม / บุญเลิศ เสนานนท์ “จาริกฐานพระพุทธรูปพระเจ้ายุธิธีระ” ศิลปกร, 31.4, 2530, 80-82.

Thon 1971 Chronicle of Chiang Mai

ทน ตนมั่น (ปริวรรต) “ต้านานพื้นเมืองเชียงใหม่” กรุงเทพฯ สำนักนายก รัฐมนตรี 2514.

Wachirayān Library 1908 Jinakālamālī

1. (หอพระสมุดวชิรญาณ) “หนังสือชินกามาลีนี พระยาพจนานพิมล แปล” กรุงเทพฯ. ร.ศ.127

2. (หอพระสมุดวชิรญาณ) “หนังสือชินกามาลีนี ภากยานคร” กรุงเทพฯ ร.ศ.127

- The book consists of 2 separate volumes. One volume contains a preface by Prince Damrong Rajanubhab and a JKM translation by Phrayā Phojanāphimon and others made in 1794 (JKM.WL/T); the other contains a JKM text edition in Pāli, the “Prince Damrong edition” (JKM.WL/P).

Wachirayān Library 1912 Ratanaphimphawong

(?) หอพระสมุดวชิรญาณ “หนังสือรัตนพิมพวงษ์” กรุงเทพฯ ร.ศ.131.

Wachirayān Library 1913 Tamnān Phra Sing

(Damrong Rajanubhab, Prince; ed.) “ตํานานพระพุทธสิหิง” กรุงเทพฯ (2456).²⁰

Wachirayān Library 1918 Tamnān Phra Sing

(Damrong Rajanubhab, Prince; ed.) “ตํานานพระพุทธสิหิง” กรุงเทพฯ (2456).²¹

- Reprint of Wachirayān Library 1913 Tamnān Phra Sing.

Wachirayān Library 1920 Cāmadevīvāraṇa

หอพระสมุดวชิรญาณฯ “จามเทววงศ์ พงคาวดรามีเมืองหริบุญไชย” กรุงเทพฯ 2463.

Wat Chiang Man 1956 Tamnān Phra Silā

(วัดเชียงมั่น) “ตํานานพระศิลा” เชียงใหม่ 2499 (24 pp.).

Wichianprīchā 1869 Phongsāwadān Nüa

Phra Wichianprīchā (Nòi): Phra Rācha Phongsāwadān Nüa lä Tamnān Phra Kāo Mòrakot Luang Phra Bāng. Bangkok 1869.²²

- Contains as an appendix: KM-LP.

Wichianprīchā 1894 Phongsāwadān Nüa

(พระวิเชียรปรีชา [น้อย]) “ตํานานพระราชนพงษามหาดารเหนือ และตํานานพระแก้วมรกตเมืองหลวงพระบาง” กรุงเทพฯ ร.ศ.113.

- Reprint of the 1869 edition incl. KM-LP.

Wichianprīchā 1914 Phongsāwadān Nüa

(พระวิเชียรปรีชา [น้อย]) “พระราชนพงษามหาดารเหนือ” ประชุมพงษามหาดาร, 1, 2457, 1-78.

- Appendix p.79-112: ตํานานพระแก้วมรกต (= KM-LP'1914).

²⁰ Hypothetical reconstruction of author, title, place and year. See above: SIN/PA.

²¹ Same as footnote 16 above.

²² Hypothetical reconstruction on the basis of what is known of the 1894 edition.

Wichianprīchā 1963 Phongsāwadān Nüa

(พระวิเชียรบูรีชา [น้อย]) “พระราชนมพงษ์ชาตารเหนือ” ประชุมพงษ์ชาตาร ฉบับ
หล่อสุดแห่งชาติ, 1, 2457, 1-78.

- p.79-112: ตำนานพระแก้วมรกต (= KM-LP'1963)
- Reprint of the 1914 edition by Kāo Nā Publishers สำนัก
พิมพ์ก้าวหน้า, เล่ม ๑.

Wyatt 1994 Nān Chronicle

David K.Wyatt (translator and editor): The Nan Chronicle. Southeast
Asia Program, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 1994.

On the School-affiliation of the “Patna *Dhammapada*”

1. The Patna *Dhammapada*

One of the important Indian manuscripts photographed in Tibet in the 1930's by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana is that known as the “Patna *Dhammapada*” (PDhp), now available in four editions.¹ The first two—those edited by N.S. Shukla and by Gustav Roth—appeared independently of each other in 1979 and 1980. The third and fourth—those edited by Margaret Cone and by Kōgen Mizuno—appeared independently of each other in 1989 and 1990. Both Cone and Mizuno take into account the readings of Shukla and Roth.²

The palm-leaf manuscript of the PDhp gives a complete text comprising 414 (Shukla, Cone, Mizuno) or 415 (Roth) verses in twenty-two chapters (*vargga*). The contents and arrangement differ from those

¹ The PDhp itself, in its verses, uses *dhamma* rather than *dharma*: the Sanskrit title *Dharmapada* occurs only in the colophon—see Cone (1989) 215; Shukla (1979) 44; Roth (1980) 135. This was noted by von Hinüber (1989:364): “As [in the PDhp] -rm- always develops into -mm- as in Pāli, the text should be called Patna *Dhammapada*...in spite of the Sanskrit colophon”. I therefore refer to the text as “Patna *Dhammapada*”, rather than *Dharmapada*.

² Shukla (1979), Roth (1980), Cone (1989), Mizuno (1990). Cone's edition is based on a new reading of a copy of the original photographs; unfortunately the editor fails to give chapter numbers or to supply the internal enumeration of verses within chapters. All four editors list parallels to the PDhp verses in related Indic literature; Mizuno adds parallels in Chinese not given by the others. (Since Mizuno's edition only came to my notice during the final revision of this paper, I refer to it in only a few instances.) von Hinüber & Norman (1994:x) list two indexes by T. Tabata: *Index to the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dharmapada* (N.S. Shukla Edition), Kyoto, 1981, and *Index to the Patna Dharmapada* (Gustav Roth Edition), Kyoto, 1982 (neither seen).

of other known *Dharmapadas*: the Pāli *Dhammapada* (Dhp) of the Theravādins,³ the North-western Prakrit “Gāndhārī *Dharmapada*” (GDhp) attributed to the Dharmaguptakas,⁴ two *Dharmapadas* preserved in Chinese translation, and the *Udānavargas* (Uv) of the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādins in Sanskrit and in Chinese and Tibetan translation.⁵

The language of the PDhp is quite different from that of the surviving Indic *Dharmapadas* or *Udānavargas*. In his “Notes on the Patna Dharmapada”, Norman (1989) discusses some of the linguistic problems posed by the text, and the discrepancies in the readings, the numbering of verses, and the distribution of *pādas* into verses in the editions of Shukla and Roth. He notes that despite the fact that they are based on a single manuscript, the two editions “show quite remarkable differences”. In his “Origin and Varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit”, von Hinüber (1989:362–66) makes several important observations regarding the language and school of the PDhp.

³ There have been numerous editions and translations: for an extensive bibliography see Russell Webb, “The Dhammapada—East and West”, *BSR* 6/2 (1989) 166–75. I refer here to von Hinüber & Norman (1994), which lists parallels to the verses in other versions, including the PDhp.

⁴ Brough (1962).

⁵ For Sanskrit *Udānavargas* see Bernhard (1965, 1968, with references to earlier studies and editions) and Nakatani (1987); for the Tibetan *Udānavarga* see Rockhill (1883) and Dietz & Zongste (1990); for the Tibetan commentary, Prajñāvarman’s *Udānavargavivaraṇa*, see Balk (1984, 1988). For the Chinese *Dharmapadas* and *Udānavargas* see Beal (1878), Lévi (1912), Brough (1962:34–41), Willemen (1973, 1974, 1978), and Nakatani (1984). For a study of the recensions of the *Udānavarga* see Schmithausen (1970); for comparative studies of the *Dhammapada* / *Udānavarga* literature see Mizuno (1979, 1984).

2. The date of the PDhp manuscript

Shukla (1979:v–vi) describes the script as “eastern proto-Bengali”, and dates it to the 11th century. Roth (1980:82) also describes the script as “proto-Bengali”. He associates the PDhp with a group of manuscripts belonging to the “Sāṅkṛtyāyana collection”, and initially dates the group to the middle of the 12th century, since one of them bears a date equivalent to CE 1149. Later in the same article (p. 84), however, he dates one of these same manuscripts, that of the *Bhiksuni-vinaya*, to the 11th century. In his edition of the latter, which appeared in 1970, he dates the *Bhiksuni-vinaya* manuscript to “the 11th (latest 12th) century”.⁶ Cone (1989:103) concludes that the manuscript “can be dated in the second half of the 12th century”. For the purposes of this article it is sufficient to assume that the manuscript was written in the 11th or 12th century in one of the monasteries of Northern India, that is, ancient Madhyadeśa or the present Indian states of Bihar and West Bengal.⁷

3. The language of the PDhp

Shukla describes the language of the PDhp as “Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit” in his title, preface, and introduction, but does not discuss it in detail. Roth (1980:82) describes it as “more Prakritic and more homogeneous [than the language of the Lokottaravādins]” and “closely related to Pāli”. In the first part of his supplement on the PDhp (pp. 93–97) he deals with the peculiarities in some detail, concluding (p. 96) that “the general features of the language...bear the characteristic marks of a western type of Prakrit, which are very close to those of Pāli”. Mizuno (1984:168) remarks that “the language of this *Dharmapada* is totally unknown...it is intermediate between Buddhist Sanskrit and Pāli”, and

⁶ Roth (1970) xxiv, xxvii.

⁷ For the range of Madhyadeśa see *HBI* 9.

"is closer to Pāli than to any other Buddhist Prakrit language". Norman (1989:433) observes that, like the Pāli texts, the PDhp "contains anomalous forms which confirm that earlier material from different Prakrits has been 'translated' into one fairly homogeneous whole". von Hinüber (1989:365) states that "this language is certainly neither Pāli, to which it is near, nor any Buddhist Sanskrit known so far, but a new variety derived independently from Buddhist Middle Indic".

It is doubtful whether the language, which Roth (p. 93) describes as the result of "a weak attempt...to render a Prakritic text into Sanskrit", should be described as "Buddhist Hybrid"—or any other—Sanskrit. It would be less confusing to reserve the term "Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit" for Edgerton's "Group 1"—primarily the texts of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins⁸—and "Group 2"—the language of the verses of a number of Mahāyāna sūtras such as the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*,⁹ and to use the term "Buddhist Sanskrit" for the language of Edgerton's "Group 3", which includes both sūtra and śāstra literature in a Sanskrit that is generally correct, but is distinguished by the use of a large number of specifically Buddhist forms derived from Prakrit, and of common Sanskrit terms with specific Buddhist usages.¹⁰ The language of the PDhp might be referred to as a Buddhist Prakrit or a Buddhist Middle Indic.

For present purposes the important point is one raised by von Hinüber: the PDhp is composed in a unique, slightly Sanskritized, Middle Indic, quite different from the languages of the Buddhist schools whose texts have survived in an Indic language. Since the *Dhammapada*

⁸ For a recent bibliography of this group, see von Hinüber (1989) 342–44 and nn.

⁹ See von Hinüber (1989) 344–47 and nn.

¹⁰ See von Hinüber (1989) 347–49 and nn.

is a canonical text, this language must be that of the canon of a specific school. Unfortunately the manuscript does not name the school of the PDhp, and there is no translation of the text into another language, or any other source, that does so. What, then, is the school of the PDhp?

4. The school of the PDhp

Neither Shukla nor Cone discuss the school-affiliation of the text. Nakatani (1984:137) describes it as unknown. Roth (1980:82) states that "the text is not ascribed to a particular school, but was certainly within the reach of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, as it comes from the same region, indicated by the type of its script". I do not understand what Roth means by "within the reach of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins", but he seems to imply that the text was somehow affiliated with that school.¹¹

von Hinüber (1989:362) points out the inadequacy of such an affiliation, noting that "even a very superficial glance at the language of the PDhp reveals features alien to the known Mahāsāṃghika tradition". After eliminating either a (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin or Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin provenance for the text, he goes on to say (p. 365): "Although it is easy to find a negative answer, it cannot be determined in any positive way, to which school the PDhp may belong, as no information seems to survive even on the schools flourishing during the very last phase of Buddhism in Eastern India". Here I must disagree with the learned scholar, since I feel that we do indeed have information on the schools of the period in question: enough, perhaps, to divine the school of our text. Unfortunately this evidence is scattered, for the most part in

¹¹ In a later publication, Roth (1985:132) indeed includes the PDhp in a list of Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin texts. K.R. Norman has also described the PDhp as Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin (*Pāli Literature*, Wiesbaden, 1983, p. 60).

Tibetan sources, most of which remain to be explored, and the subject begs for a monograph or even a book.¹² In the following I will present a preliminary sketch from readily accessible sources such as the works of Tāranātha (1575–1634).¹³ I will first discuss briefly the relation between language and school (§ 5), and then proceed to eliminate those schools which, for historical or geographical reasons, are unsuitable candidates for the transmission of the PDhp (§ 6). I will next present positive evidence for the existence of “Four Main Schools” in Madhyadeśa during our period (§ 7). After this anabasis, I will finally venture to suggest a school-affiliation for our text (§ 8).

5. The rise of the Buddhist schools: Vinaya, dialect, and region

Before the beginning of the Common Era, the Buddhist order had divided into a number of schools: eighteen according to a common count. Traditional sources present a number of reasons for the rise of these schools: differences in the interpretation of the Vinaya and in the use of language, combined with the influence of individual teachers and dispersal over a far-flung area. I-ching noted that “if we observe the differences among the four *nikāyas* carefully, the conspicuous differences are in the disciplinary practices”.¹⁴ Bangwei Wang remarks that “I-ching

¹² Among the problems that cannot be adequately addressed here are the dates of the persons mentioned in Tibetan sources, which are often related to the regnal dates of Indian kings, which are themselves controversial (see e.g. Huntington 1984:29–38 and accompanying tables for the complexities of Pāla chronology). Others include the spelling or correct form of these names, and the reading and dating of relevant inscriptions.

¹³ I do not doubt that important references await discovery in the vast Tibetan historiographical and bibliographical literature. A recent revelation from veteran *gter ston* Leonard van der Kuij is mentioned below.

¹⁴ Wang (1994) 180, n. 61. The four *nikāyas* will be listed and discussed below.

talked a lot about *nikāyas*, but we have to notice that he talked about them always in connection with Vinaya. When I-ching spoke of 'practice', he meant the practice of disciplinary life, *i.e.* the Vinaya rules".¹⁵ Nearly a thousand years later, Tāranātha remarked that "it is necessary to understand that the division into the four schools (*nikāya*) resulted from distinctions in the practice of Vinaya".¹⁶ Vinītadeva states that the eighteen different schools arose from distinctions in region, exegesis, and teachers.¹⁷

The Indian scholar Śākyaprabha (8th century) and the Tibetan polymaths Bu ston (1290–1364) and Tāranātha point out that the use of regional dialects affected the transmission of the Buddhavacana from an early date, starting from the 2nd century after the Parinirvāṇa. Bu ston reports that the Buddhavacana came to be recited in Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhraṃśa, and Paiśācika by that time, and that this led to the birth of the eighteen schools.¹⁸ Śākyaprabha's *Prabhāvatī*, representing a Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition, also attributes the rise of the schools to recitation in different languages.¹⁹ We need not, however, conclude that there were eighteen different languages (although according to the *Vimalaprabhā Laghukālacakratantrarājā-tīkā* "even 96 languages are said to be found in Buddhist texts").²⁰ A reasonable summary is given by mKhas grub rje (1385–1438): "According to one system, 160 years after

¹⁵ Wang (1994) 180 (see also 174–75, § 1.12.5).

¹⁶ Tāranātha, *History*, 209.4/342 *sde bži'i dbye 'byed kyan 'dul ba'i spyod pa las dbye bar go dgos so*.

¹⁷ Vinītadeva, in *Tibetan Tripitaka*, Peking ed., No. 5641, Vol. 127, *'dul ba'i 'grel pa u*, 187b7 *yul don slob dpon bye brag gis, tha dad rnam pa bco brgyad gsuṅs*.

¹⁸ Obermiller (1932) 96; Vogel (1985) 105; Yuyama (1980) 177. See also Tāranātha, *History*, 42.2/81.

¹⁹ Obermiller (1932) 98; Vogel (1985) 106 (*skad tha dad kyis 'don pas*).

²⁰ von Hinüber (1989) 361.

the Nirvāṇa of the Teacher, in the city of Me tog gis brgyan, the elders (*sthaviras*) of four saṃghas recited the Āgama in four different languages: Sanskrit, Apabhraṃṣa, Prakrit, and Paiśācika. As a result the disciples had different views, and separated into the four basic schools. These in turn gave birth to internal subdivisions, giving rise to the division into eighteen schools".²¹ Bu ston and others list the languages employed by each of the four schools:

(Mūla)Sarvāstivādins:	Sanskrit
Mahāsāṃghikas:	Prakrit
Sāmmatīyas:	Apabhraṃṣa
Sthaviras:	Paiśācī.

While all sources agree that the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādins employed Sanskrit, they allot different languages to the other three schools.²² The important point is that rather than Sanskrit each used a recognizably different variety of Prakrit (taking the latter term in its broader sense).

²¹ Lessing & Wayman (1968) 66–67 *yaṅ lugs gcig la ston pa mya ḥan las 'das nas lo brgya dañ drug cu 'das pa na, groñ khyer me tog gis brgyan žes bya bar dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan bži, skad mi mthun pa sam-skṛ-ta dañ, zur chag dañ, tha mal pa dañ, śa za'i skad kyis luñ 'don pas slob ma rnams lta ba mi mthun par gyur pas, rtsa ba'i sde pa bžir gyes so. de dag kyañ nañ gses kyis dbye ba so sor gyes pas sde pa bco brgyad du gyes so.* As Roth (1985:131) points out, the four languages are listed at Mvy §§ 4717–20.

²² Obermiller (1932) 99–100, also translated in Vogel (1985) 107–8 and discussed in Yuyama (1980) 175–81, Roth (1985) 127–37, and von Hinüber (1989) 361–62. An earlier discussion of the conflicting traditions as presented in European scholarship from the time of Alexander Csoma de Körös is given by Lin Li-kouang (1949) 176 foll. mKhas grub rje distributes the languages differently: Lessing & Wayman (1968) 68–69.

6. Regional and lesser schools

While some schools spread over a wide area, others arose in particular regions—perhaps around charismatic teachers—and are not known to have gained influence beyond their original areas. These include, for example, the “Mahāgirīya” schools of the Western Ghats—the Dharmottarīyas, Bhadrayānīyas, and Śāṇagarikas²³—and the “Andhakas” of present-day Andhra Pradesh—the Pūrva- or Uttaraśailas, the Aparaśailas, Rājagiriyas, and Siddhārthikas.²⁴ Other schools are obscure: known only from the occasional reference, they probably enjoyed only brief existences. We are concerned here with the Madhyadeśa: since these regional and lesser schools are not known to have had any foothold there, and since most or all of them had died out by our period, we may leave them out of consideration.²⁵

A fivefold division of schools—Sarvāstivādin, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka, Mahāsāṃghika (or Vātsīputrīya),²⁶ Kāśyapiya—was known

²³ Bareau (1955) 127–30.

²⁴ Bareau (1955) 89 and 99–109. A possible example of the Prakrit employed by the Pūrvaśailas is found in citation by Candrakirti (late 6th or early 7th century) in his *Prasannapadā*: see de La Vallée Poussin’s edition p. 548.5, and Paul Harrison, “Sanskrit Fragments of a Lokottaravādin Tradition”, in L.A. Hercus *et al.* (ed.), *Indological and Buddhist Studies* (Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday), Delhi, 1982, pp. 225 foll. This Prakrit, as tentatively restored by Harrison, is quite different from the language of the PDhp (and also from that of the Lokottaravādins). Candrakirti refers elsewhere to the seven Piṭakas of the Pūrva- and Aparaśailas: see Per K. Sorensen, *Candrakirti, Triśāraṇasaptati, the Septuagint on the Three Refuges*, Vienna, 1986, pp. 51–53 (vv. 57–58).

²⁵ The demise of these schools can be determined from archaeological evidence (the abandonment of sites in the Western Ghats and Andhra Pradesh), and from the reports of the Chinese pilgrims and of Tibetan historians. See Bareau (1955) and *HBI* 600–1 for details.

²⁶ Various lists give one or the other, with a marked preference for the first.

in China during the first half of the first millennium of the Common Era.²⁷ This classification describes the situation in the far West, the North-west, and Central Asia, areas which had extensive contacts via the trade routes with the Middle Kingdom during the period. It would have never reflected the situation in the other parts of India, particularly Madhyadeśa, with which we are herein concerned. This was noted by I-ching: "I have never heard, in the West (India), of the division into five principal schools (*nikāya*), of which some Chinese make use".²⁸

I-ching also remarks that "not one of the three schools derived from the Sarvāstivādins—the Dharmaguptakas, the Mahīśāsakas, and the Kāśyapīyas—is practised in India. It is only in Uddiyāna, Kutcha, and in Khotan that they have some adherents, mixed with those of other schools."²⁹ The same situation had already been described by Hsüan-tsang at the beginning of the 7th century, when he noted the presence of the three schools in Uddiyāna, but not in India proper.³⁰ Tibetan sources do not give any indication that these schools were active in Madhyadeśa during our period.

²⁷ Lin Li-kouang (1949) 189–91; Bareau (1955) 22; *HBI* 593–94; Wang (1994) 173.

²⁸ Takakusu (1896) 8; Lin Li-kouang (1949) 191–92.

²⁹ Lin Li-kouang (1949) 191–92; Takakusu (1896) 20; Bareau (1955) 39–40, 182. Although the early lists show some confusion regarding the affiliation of these three schools to the other schools, by the time of I-ching they were grouped, rightly or wrongly, with the Sarvāstivādins. There are cogent reasons for accepting the thesis that the "Gāndhārī *Dharmapada*" belonged to the canon of the (early) Dharmaguptakas, although, like the PDhp, the manuscript does not identify its school.

³⁰ Since I-ching did not visit Uddiyāna, his statement may have been based upon that of his illustrious predecessor. He was, however, a scrupulous investigator: at one point (Takakusu 1896:43) he says that "Although I, myself, did not see all these parts of India, I could nevertheless ascertain anything by careful inquiry". Since his main concern was the Vinaya and its proper and minute observance, we may rely on his testimony.

7. Schools contemporary to the PDhp manuscript

We may now turn to Madhyadeśa. A convenient starting point is the 7th century, for which we may turn to the eye-witness reports of the erudite Chinese pilgrims. Although Hsüan-tsang does not explicitly say so, an analysis of his remarks about the sectarian affiliation of monasteries reveals that only four *nikāyas* were active in Madhyadeśa in the second quarter of the century. Lamotte writes that "on constate qu'à l'époque de Hiuan-tsang quatres écoles hinayānistes seulement étaient encore représentées".³¹ I-ching is quite explicit about the situation at the end of the 7th century. He states that "in the five parts of India and in the islands in the South Sea, four *nikāyas* are spoken of everywhere".³² I-ching lists the four schools:³³

- (1) the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika, with seven branches, unspecified;
- (2) the Ārya-Sthavira, with three branches, unspecified;
- (3) the Ārya-Mūlasarvāstivāda, with three branches;³⁴
- (4) the Ārya-Sāmmatiya, with four branches, unspecified.

Similar classifications are given in other sources, from Vinitadeva in the 8th century to the *Varṣāgrapṛcchā*, translated into Tibetan in the 11th century, most of which list the branches in full.³⁵ In his *History of*

³¹ HBI 596–601; see also Bareau (1955) 38.

³² Wang (1994) 180; see also HBI 601.

³³ Takakusu (1896) 7–8; HBI 601–2; Bareau (1955) 24.

³⁴ I-ching lists these further on (Takakusu 1896:20) as (a) Dharmaguptaka, (b) Mahīśāsaka, (c) Kāśyapiya—schools already eliminated for the Madhyadeśa by I-ching himself (above, § 6).

³⁵ Bareau (1955) 24–26. The details of the lists (for which see *HBI* and Bareau 1955), which do not always agree, need not detain us here. (For the branches of the Sarvāstivādins see Skilling 1993, Table 7A; for the three branches of the Sthaviras, see *ibid* pp. 154–55 and Table 7C.)

Buddhism, Tāranātha refers several times to the basic fourfold division.³⁶ Our sources thus agree that in Northern and North-eastern India there were four main schools.

A common misconception, long disproven but regrettably not yet put to rest, is that during the Pāla-Sena period only the Mahāyāna, along with the Vajrayāna, survived in India. This assumption ignores the fundamental fact that there was no such thing as a Mahāyāna ordination (*upasampadā*): a monk, a *bhikṣu*, no matter what his philosophical preferences, had to ordain according to one of the Śrāvaka Vinaya lineages.³⁷ The relationship between ordination into the four schools and the Mahāyāna was noted by I-ching (Takakusu 1896:14–15): “both [Śrāvakayāna and Mahāyāna] adopt one and the same Vinaya”. He also remarked that “if one worships bodhisattvas and reads Mahāyāna scriptures, he will be called a Mahāyānist, otherwise a Hinayānist”, and “among these four *nikāyas* some belong to Mahāyāna and some to Hinayāna”.³⁸ Similarly, Tāranātha observed that “with the spread of the Mahāyāna, the entire Mahāyāna samgha belonged to these very schools (*sde pa*, *nikāya*), although they adhered to the tenets (*grub mtha'*, *siddhānta*) of the Mahāyāna”.³⁹ A connection between the four schools and the Vajrayāna is seen from the fact that they are given a symbolic interpretation in the *Hevajra Tantra*.⁴⁰

³⁶ See especially Chap. 42, *sDe pa bži'i don la cuṇ zad dpyad pa'i skabs* (tr. 339–42): some points are obscure, and a new translation is needed.

³⁷ There were, of course, bodhisattva and Vajrayāna vows, which could be undertaken either by monastics, on top of their Vinaya vows, or by lay-followers.

³⁸ Both citations are from Wang (1994) 181; cp. Takakusu (1896) 14–15, taking into account Wang's n. 64.

³⁹ Tāranātha, *History*, 208.21/342.

⁴⁰ D.L. Snellgrove, *The Hevajra Tantra: A Critical Study*, London, 1959 (London Oriental Series 6), Vol. II, pp. 4–7, 68–71 (vv. 58–60), with the commentary, *Yogaratnamālā*, 149.15; Charles Willemen (tr.), *The Chinese Hevajratantra*, Leuven, n.d. (1982?) (Orientalia Gandensia VIII), pp. 38–39.

Since monks and monasteries continued to exist throughout the Pāla-Sena period, Śrāvaka Vinaya lineages must also have survived unbroken. The existence of the four schools (*sde pa bži*, with only the Mahāsāṃghikas specified) at Nālandā in the time of Devapāla (9th century) is mentioned in passing by Abhayadatta (late 11th or early 12th century).⁴¹ The *Blue Annals* records that in the late 10th century Atiśa "listened to" most of the Three Piṭakas of the four schools (*sde pa bži'i sde snod gsum*).⁴² Atiśa's disciple Nag tsho, in his *Stotra of Eighty Ślokas*, says: "At Otantapuri, there were 53 monks. At Vikramaśila, there were about a hundred monks. All the four main schools were found among them".⁴³ In his *History of Buddhism*, Tāranātha records that King Mahāpāla (early 11th century?), son and successor of Mahipāla, reigned for 41 years, and "mainly made offerings to the Śrāvaka saṃgha (*ñan thos kyi dge 'dun*) at the Odantapuri *vihāra*, maintaining 500 *bhikṣus* and 500 dharma-preachers. As a branch he built a *vihāra* called Uruvāsa, where he maintained 500 Sendhapa śrāvakas."⁴⁴ He also actively supported Vikramaśilā, Nālandā, Somapuri, and other *vihāras*.⁴⁵ During the reign of Rāmapāla (late 11th or early 12th century) over 160 paṇḍitas and 1000 monks were permanent residents (*gtan du bžugs pa'i dge sloi*) at Vikramaśilā; up to 5000 *pravrajitas* (*rab byuñ*) gathered from time to time for offerings (*mchod* = *pūjā*). At Vajrāsana the King maintained 40 Mahāyānists and 200 Śrāvaka *bhikṣus* as permanent residents; at times

97–98. Cf. also Tāranātha, *History*, 207.14/340 *de yañ rgyud sde du ma las rtsa ba'i sde pa bži yin par gsuñs śiñ*.

⁴¹ Acharya Sempa Dorje, *The Biography of Eighty-four Saints*, Sarnath, 1979, Tibetan text p. 144.1 *sde pa bži yod pa'i phal chen sde pa'i mkhan po*; Robinson (1979), Tibetan text 171.1 (mistranslated on p. 146).

⁴² *BA* I 298.16/ I 243.

⁴³ Citation from *BA* (tr.) I 243, n. 2.

⁴⁴ For the Sendhapa śrāvakas see below.

⁴⁵ Tāranātha, *History*, 175.1/289. This may well be the Mahāpāla under whom, according to the *Seven Instruction Lineages* (632.4/60), mantra practices were banned for *bhikṣus*.

up to 10,000 Śrāvaka *bhikṣus* gathered there. At Odantapurī 1000 monks of both Hinayāna and Mahāyāna resided permanently, and at times 12,000 *pravrajitas* assembled.⁴⁶ In his *Seven Instruction Lineages*, Tāranātha states that Abhayākaragupta “became widely learned in the Vinayas of the four schools (*sde pa bzi*), in most of the Śrāvaka Piṭakas” (apparently at Nālandā).⁴⁷ Abhayākaragupta, who flourished during the reign of Rāmapāla, composed works on Vinaya; he was highly regarded by the King, and became abbot of Vajrāsana, and later of Nālandā and Vikramaśilā.⁴⁸

These references establish the existence of the Śrāvaka Vinaya lineages of the four schools in the great monasteries of Madhyadeśa throughout the Pāla-Sena period. Our sources also make specific references to each of the schools.

The Mahāsāṃghikas

In his *History* Tāranātha refers to Ānandagarbha of Magadha and Vāgiśvarakīrti of Vārāṇasī, who ordained in the Mahāsāṃghika *nikāya* in the late Pāla period.⁴⁹ During the “period of the four Sena Kings” Buddhaśrī of Nepal acted as Sthavira of the Mahāsāṃghikas at Vikramaśilā for a time, before returning to Nepal; Ratnaraksita ordained in that sect, and acted as Mantrācārya at Vikramaśilā.⁵⁰ In his *Seven Instruction Lineages* Tāranātha records that, during the reign of Dharmapāla (second half of the 8th century), Buddhaśrījñāna and his disciple Dīpamkarabhadra ordained in the Mahāsāṃghika tradition, the

⁴⁶ Tāranātha, *History*, 189.13/313.

⁴⁷ Tāranātha, *Seven Instruction Lineages*, 647.2/71.

⁴⁸ Tāranātha, *Seven Instruction Lineages*, 649.5/72; see also *History*, 189.10/313.

⁴⁹ Tāranātha, *History*, 172.9/285; 178.19/296.

⁵⁰ Tāranātha, *History*, 192.2/317.

former (and perhaps also the latter) at Nālandā.⁵¹ According to the *Blue Annals*, in the late 10th century Atiśa was ordained at the age of 29 by Śilarakṣita, Sthavira of the Mahāsāṃghika school, belonging to the lineage of Buddhajñānapāda, at the Mativihāra at Vajrāsana.⁵² Abhayadatta refers to the Mahāsāṃghikas, probably at Somapura Mahāvihāra.⁵³

These references confirm that the Mahāsāṃghika ordination lineage survived in India until the Sena period. This no doubt explains why the Lokottaravādin *Mahāvastu* was preserved in Nepal, and why several Lokottaravādin Vinaya texts were carried to Tibet, despite the fact that the Mūlasarvāstivādin ordination lineage had held sway there since the 8th century.⁵⁴ The fact that the surviving Mahāsāṃghika texts, from both Nepal and Tibet, belong to the Lokottaravādins suggests that this branch represented the Mahāsāṃghikas in Madhyadeśa and Nepal during our period.

The (Mūla)Sarvāstivādins

I-tsing notes that "in Magadha the doctrines of the four *nikāyas* are generally in practice, yet the Sarvāstivāda *nikāya* flourishes the most".⁵⁵ Tāranātha refers to Śāntipa, who ordained as a Sarvāstivādin at

⁵¹ Tāranātha, *Seven Instruction Lineages*, 626.2/56 and 632.4/60.

⁵² BA I 298.13/242–43. See also 'Brom ston pa's *stotra* to Dīpamkara, v. 4, in Alaka Chattopadhyaya, *Atiśa and Tibet: Life and Works of Dīpamkara Śrījñāna in relation to the History and Religion of Tibet*, Calcutta, 1967, p. 372: "Dīpamkara-śrī...ordained a *bhikṣu* by the Mahāsāṃghika".

⁵³ Sempa Dorje, *op. cit.*, Tibetan text 16.13, *phal chen sde pa'i dge 'dun*. The reference is uncertain since a variant reads "Sarvāstivādin saṃgha" (*yod par smra ba'i dge 'dun*): Robinson (1979), Tibetan text p. 316, folio 17, line 5. The translation, pp. 31–32, omits the reference.

⁵⁴ For these texts see Roth (1980) 81 and von Hinüber (1989) 342–43.

⁵⁵ Takakusu (1896) 8; Bareau (1955) 39.

Odantapuri, mastered the entire Śrāvaka Tripitaka, and became abbot of Somapurī.⁵⁶ He also records that Ratigupta ordained in the Sarvāstivādin lineage.⁵⁷ The *Blue Annals* states that Karopa, disciple of Maitripa (11th century), was ordained by Mitratāra, the great scholar of the Sarvāstivāda at Vikramaśilā, where he studied the Luñ sde bži with Vimalakoṣa, the great Vinayadhara.⁵⁸ The Mūlasarvāstivādins are mentioned as one of the four schools at Nālandā by Grags pa rgyal mtshan (1147–1216).⁵⁹ Inscriptions of the later period that mention the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādins are few. A bronze pedestal inscription from Nālandā, dated paleographically to the reign of Devapāladeva (9th century), extols a Sarvāstivādin *bhikṣu* from Nālandā named Mañjuśrīvarman, who appears, from his name and the contents of the inscription, to have adhered to the Mahāyāna.⁶⁰ A stone inscription from Patna district, dated to the reign of Mahīpāla (late 10th or early 11th century), records the setting up of a *nāga* image by a Mūlasarvāstivādin.⁶¹ By our period the Sarvāstivādins had probably been superseded by the Mūlasarvāstivādins, and Tibetan references to the Sarvāstivādins may well be a shorthand for the Mūlasarvāstivādins.⁶²

The Sthaviras

We know from Indian inscriptions, from the chronicles of Ceylon, Burma, and Siam, and from Tāranātha that Sthavira or

⁵⁶ Tāranātha, *Seven Instruction Lineages*, 642.1/67.

⁵⁷ Tāranātha, *Seven Instruction Lineages*, 661.3/82.

⁵⁸ B4 II 990–91/II 847.

⁵⁹ *Sa skyā bka' bum*, Vol. 6 (*cha*), 684.1.

⁶⁰ Sastri (1942) 103.

⁶¹ Huntington (1984) § 34, pp. 225–26.

⁶² Tāranātha's reference to the Tāmraśātiyas as a surviving branch of the Sarvāstivādins is obscure. Very little is known of this school, and the reports of their affiliation to the other schools are conflicting: see Skilling (1993) 154–69 for a preliminary sketch of the problem.

Theravādin monks regularly visited and resided in the region, particularly at Bodh Gaya. In addition, the "Continental Sthaviras"—the Sthaviras based in India as opposed to those who came as visitors from either Śrī Laṅkā or South-east Asia—may have been represented in the area.⁶³ That Sthavira scriptures were preserved in Madhyadeśa during our period is shown by the *Samskrtaśaṃskṛtaviniścaya*, a text most probably composed there in the 12th or 13th century.⁶⁴ The author, Daśabalaśrīmitra, devotes three chapters (Chaps. 13–15) to their tenets, in the form of an abridged citation of the *Vimuttimagga*. Outside of these chapters, he also cites from other Sthavira texts on ten occasions.⁶⁵

Lokottaravādins, (Mūla)Sarvāstivādins, Sthaviras and the PDhp

The three schools discussed so far may be rejected as candidates for the school of the PDhp on linguistic and textual grounds. The language of the PDhp is not that of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins. Furthermore, the *Mahāvastu* of that school preserves a *Sahasravarga* (*dharmaṇadeśu sahasravarga*): when compared with Chapter 21 of the PDhp, which bears the same title, one sees that the number (22 in PDhp, 24 in *Mahāvastu*) and sequence of verses is quite different.⁶⁶ Other

⁶³ For the problem of the "Continental Sthaviras", see Skilling, *op. cit.*

⁶⁴ Cf. Skilling (1987) 3–23 for references.

⁶⁵ Cf. Skilling (1987) 4, 7–8.

⁶⁶ A similar set of verses, apparently described only as *gāthā*, occurs in the Chinese *Abhiniṣkramana-sūtra* summarized by Samuel Beal as *The Romantic Legend of Śākyā Buddha*, [London, 1875] Delhi, 1985, pp. 310–11. This seems to add one more *Sahasravarga* to those already available: that is, Dhp Chap. 8, *Sahassavagga*; GDhp Chap. 19 (title not available); PDhp Chap. 21, *Sahasravagga*; *Udānavarga* Chap. 24, *Peyālavarga*; and *Mahāvastu*. If the school of this *Abhiniṣkramana-sūtra* can be determined—Beal claims a Dharmaguptaka provenance, but this is uncertain—and the set of verses can be related to any of the existing *Dharmapadas* this would further add to our knowledge.

dharmapada verses cited here and there throughout the *Mahāvastu* belong to a different linguistic transmission.⁶⁷ The language of the Sarvāstivādins and Mūlasarvāstivādins was Sanskrit, and their counterparts of the *Dharmapada* survive as their *Udānavargas*.⁶⁸ The PDhp differs in language, in arrangement of chapters, in inclusion or omission of verses, and within individual verses from the *Dhammapada* of the Mahāvihāravāsin Sthaviras of Ceylon.⁶⁹

This leaves one more school, the Sāmmatīyas, which we will examine in detail in the following section.

8. The Sāmmatīyas

At the time of Hsüan-tsang (second quarter of the 7th century), the Sāmmatīyas⁷⁰ were the most numerous sect: they were predominant in

⁶⁷ See e.g. Lévi (1912) 214–15 and Brough (1962) 35.

⁶⁸ As noted above, von Hinüber (1989) already rejected the possibility of a Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin or (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin affiliation. Philosophical trends or movements within the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin fold—the Vaibhāṣikas and the Sautrāntikas—need not be considered, since they employed the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin canon, and did not have their own separate collections.

⁶⁹ We may eliminate the other branches of the Ceylon Sthaviras—the Abhayagirivāsins and the Jetavāṇiyas—and also the “Continental Sthaviras”: their canons no doubt resembled that of the Mahāvihāravāsins, and we have no evidence of Sthavira texts being transmitted in any Indian language other than Pāli.

⁷⁰ There are two questions regarding the Indic form of the name of this school: whether the *a* of the first syllable should be long or short, and whether the vowel of the second syllable should be *a* or *i* (both short). I follow the spelling Sāmmatīya—with *vrddhi* in the first syllable and short *a* in the second—as attested in Yaśomitra’s *Kośavyākhyā* (Swami Dwarikadas Shastri [ed.], *Abhidharmakośabhasyam*, Vol. 4, Varanasi, 1973, p. 1191, *Vātsiputriyā Āryasāmmatīyāḥ*). The colophon to Ārya Vimuktasena’s *Abhisamayālāmkaṛa-vṛtti* (Kaurukulla-ārya-sāmmatīya: see n. 74 below), *Mvy* § 9085, and a Sanskrit

Western India (Sindh and Gujarat), and also represented in Magadha.⁷¹ A half-century later, I-ching remarked that the Sāmmatīyas were predominant in Lāṭa and Sindh.⁷² Bu ston and Tāraṇātha agree that the

manuscript from Nepal (see below, n. 76) have short *a* in the first and second syllables. The form with *a* in the second syllable (and, properly, with *vṛddhi* in the first) is the basis of the two Tibetan translations Maṇi pos bkur ba'i sde and Kun gyis bkur ba'i sde: it derives from the name of the school's founder, Sammata, who presided over the fourth council (see Skilling 1982:41 and cp. *Mvy* § 3552, Maṇi pos bkur ba = Mahāsammata [here the first, elected King of Buddhist lore]).

But these might be later forms, since earlier records show *i* in second place. These include an inscription from Mathura (*EI* XIX, p. 67 ācariyāna samitiyāna) and Chinese transliterations (e.g. *KBC* 972 *San mi ti pu lun*) and translations (e.g. Takakusu 1896, p. 8, "Noble School of the Right Measure"). The Pāli forms vary: Sammitī (*Dīpavaṇṇa* V, 46), Samitiyā (*Kathāvatthu-āṭhakathā*, Nālandā ed. pp. 4.24, 11.14), and Sammitiyā (*Mahāvaṇṇa* V, 7, from *Vāmsatthappakāśinī*, PTS ed., Vol. I, p. 174.8, with the same in the commentary at line 17 and in the *Extended Mahāvaṇṇa* published by Malalasekera in 1937). (See also *DPPN* II 1064, which also gives Sammatīya: I do not know if this form is in fact attested in Pāli.) Candrakīrti gives long ā in the first syllable, and *i* in the second: Sāmmitiyāḥ (*Prasannapadā*, ed. Louis de La Vallée Poussin, pp. 148.1, 192.8, 276.2). An inscription from Sarnath is not clear (*EI* VIII, Pl. 21, i.f, read at p. 172 as ā[cā]ryaṇam sa[mmi]tiyāṇam). Although the second syllable of the second word does not show the distinct *i* of other syllables, it is unclear (altered, or damaged?), and is hard to construe as simply a double *ma*. For the name see further the remarks at Bareau (1955) 121 and Skilling (1982) 45–46.

Literature on the Sāmmatīyas is scant: see Louis de La Vallée Poussin, "Sāmmatiyas", *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. 11, 168–69; Bareau (1955) 121–26; Venkataramanan (1953); Skilling (1982, 1987); Thich Thien Chau (1987). La Vallée Poussin (*Prasannapadā*, 148, n. 1) makes the interesting remark that "les Sāmmitiyas représentent le Petit Véhicule dans la *Madhyamakavṛtti*". We eagerly await the promised publication of the theses of Thich Thien Chau (translated from the French by Sarah Boin-Webb) and of Leonard Priestley (Toronto), which should add a great deal to our present meagre knowledge.

⁷¹ *HBI* 597–601; Bareau (1955) 121; Joshi (1977) 40–45.

⁷² Takakusu (1896) 9.

great logician Dignāga was ordained by a Vātsiputriya (the forerunner of the Sāmmatiyas) preceptor (*gnas ma bu'i sde pa'i mkhan po*); the latter adds that this occurred in the South, in the region of Kāñcī, and that the preceptor was named Nāgadatta.⁷³ Bu ston notes that Ārya Vimuktisena, author of a commentary on the *Pañcavimśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* according to the system of the *Abhisamayālañkāra*, was ordained as a Kaurukulla Sāmmatiya, a statement confirmed by (or perhaps based upon) the colophon to that work, which is preserved in Sanskrit.⁷⁴ These two references, though earlier than our period, show that two important figures of Indian Mahāyāna held Vātsiputriya or Sāmmatiya ordination, although their own philosophical standpoints were scarcely compatible with that of the “Pudgalavāda”.

We have seen above that the Sāmmatiyas were one of the four schools represented throughout the Pāla-Sena period in the Madhyadeśa, at the great *vihāras* of Odantapuri, Vikramashilā, and Nālandā. For the later period, Tāranātha, in his *Seven Instruction Lineages*, refers to Ācārya Jñānamitra, a śūdra of Tripura, who was ordained in the East at Jagaddala *vihāra*; he belonged to the Sāmmatiya school, and was learned in the Vinaya and Abhidharma Piṭakas according to their system.⁷⁵ A Sanskrit history of the Vajrayoginī cult from Nepal notes that the (future *siddha*) Maitrīgupta ordained as a Sāmmatiya at Vikramapura in the first half of the 11th century, and “listened to” the Sūtra, Abhidharma, and Vinaya.⁷⁶ In the late 12th century Vibhūticandra, from Varendra in

⁷³ Bu ston 159.1, Obermiller (1932) 149; Tāranātha, *History*, 102.1/181.

⁷⁴ Bu ston 162, ult, 'phags pa ku ru ku lle'i sde pa, Obermiller (1932) 155. Corrado Pensa, *L'Abhisamayālañkāravṛtti di Ārya-Vimuktisena*, Primo Abhisamaya, Rome, 1967 (Serie Orientale Roma XXXVII), p. 1, n. 1.

⁷⁵ Tāranātha, *Seven Instruction Lineages*, 623.4/53.

⁷⁶ Sylvain Lévi, “Un nouveau document sur le bouddhisme de basse époque dans l’Inde”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* VI (1931), p. 423 penult; for the date see Mark Tatz, “The Life of the Siddha-Philosopher Maitrigupta”,

Eastern India, ordained with the Sāmmatīyas. He travelled several times to Tibet, and lived there for many years.⁷⁷ But the school continued even beyond that: in an extraordinary Tibetan record recently revealed to the scholarly world by van der Kuijp we find a Sāmmatīya monk from Eastern India named Lokottara, a student of Madhyamaka, Pramāṇa, and Vajrayāna, roaming from Kashmir to Central Tibet in the 1460's.⁷⁸

No identified text of the Sāmmatīyas has been preserved in an Indian language. Indeed, considering the numerical strength and geographical reach of the school reported by Hsüan-tsang and I-ching, it is remarkable that it seems to have left virtually no traces in India. Hsüan-tsang brought back to China fifteen works from the Tripitaka of the Sāmmatīyas, but unfortunately they were never translated.⁷⁹ I-ching notes that “the three Piṭakas of the [Sāmmatīyas] contain 200,000 stanzas, the Vinaya texts alone amounting to 30,000 stanzas”.⁸⁰ Only two Sāmmatīya works are preserved in Chinese—one dealing with doctrine and one with Vinaya.⁸¹ That the literature of this school was preserved in Northern

Journal of the American Oriental Society 107/4 [Oct.-Dec. 1987], pp. 695-711. I suppose that Vikramapura = Vikramaśilā.

⁷⁷ See Cyrus Stearns, “The Life and Tibetan Legacy of the Indian Mahāpaṇḍita Vibhūticandra”, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 19.1 (1996), pp. 128-29.

⁷⁸ Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp, “Some Indian and Sri Lankan Peregrinators in Central Tibet and Glo bo Smon thang during the Fifteenth Century”, paper read at the Seventh Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Seggau, Graz, 1995. I am grateful to Dr. van der Kuijp for giving me permission to refer to his paper, which will appear in the forthcoming proceedings.

⁷⁹ Lin Li-kouang (1949) 206.

⁸⁰ Takakusu (1896) 8.

⁸¹ That is, the **Sāmmitīyanikāya-śāstra* (Taishō 1649, *KBC* 972, translated in Venkataramanan [1953]) and the **Vinayadvāvīmśativedyā-śāstra* (Taishō 1461, *KBC* 942): see Bareau (1955) 122, Wang (1994) 173, 175, Thich Thien Chau (1987:34, 43-4). Thich Thien Chau (p. 34) adds two more “Pudgalavāda” (*Vātsiputriya*?) works in Chinese (Taishō 1505 and 1506 = *KBC* 1019 and 965).

Continues...

India during our period is amply demonstrated by Daśabalaśrīmitra in his *Samskṛtāsamskṛtaviniścaya*: he devotes six full chapters to the tenets of the Sāmmatīyas in the form of direct citation from their *Āgama* (*lun*, in this case “tradition” in the sense of śāstra rather than sūtra). In addition, he cites their tenets in a number of other places. Daśabalaśrīmitra’s citations and the two Chinese translations supply first-hand information about Sāmmatīya tenets, for which we also have information from references in non-Sāmmatīya works. (The London Tun huang collection preserves a short commentary on the *ye dharmā* verse entitled *Pratīyasamutpāda-gāthā-vyākhyāna* by Ācārya Vinayavarman of the Sāmmatīya school.⁸² Until the work is studied, we cannot determine whether it propounds any specific doctrines of the school, since Vinayavarman might also be a Mahāyānist belonging to the Sāmmatīya Vinaya lineage.)

The Sāmmatīyas and the PDhp

Although no part of the canon of the Sāmmatīyas has been preserved, we can deduce from citations in their śāstra literature that they transmitted counterparts of sūtras found in the canons of the other schools. The *Sāmmatīyanikāya-śāstra* contains many brief citations,

Wang (p. 173) mentions one other lost translation, a Vinaya text entitled **Sāmmatīya-sūtra*, known only from catalogues.

⁸² Louis de La Vallée Poussin, *Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-huang in the India Office Library*, Oxford, 1962, § 127.2, p. 50; Zuiho Yamaguchi et al., *A Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts collected by Sir Aurel Stein*, Part Two, The Toyo Bunko, Tokyo, 1978, pp. 51–52: (La Vallée Poussin’s transcription) *rten ciñ 'brel par 'byun ba'i tshigsu bchad pa'i rnam par bśad pa = phrad ti tya' / sa mud pā da gā tha' / byag khyā na'*; colophon (from Yamaguchi et al.) *rten ciñ 'brel ba'i 'tshigsu bchad pa rnam bśad pa / slob dpon kun gis bkur ba'i sde pa dul ba'i go chas mdzad pa rdzogs sho*. Present-day Tanjurs do not include the work, or any others by an author of that name.

including some described as *gāthā*, but very few are identified by title, and none attributed to a *Dharmapada*.⁸³ Daśabalaśrīmitra's citations include three partial verses which have parallels in the *Udānavarga*, but again the title of the source is not given. The first (156a6) is equivalent to the first three *pādas* of the famous *anityā bata samskārā* verse (Uv I, 3abc); the verse does not occur in other *Dharmapadas*, but is found elsewhere in sūtra literature. The second (157b1), equivalent to Uv XII, 6a, occurs at Dhp 278a and GDhp 107a, but not in PDhp. Since the source of the Sāmmatiya citation is not given, it need not be from their *Dharmapada*; in Pāli, for example, the verse also occurs at *Theragāthā* 677. The third is given at 163a8:

śes rab med la bṣam gtan med // bṣam gtan med na śes rab min //

This verse has parallels in all four Indic *Dharmapadas* and in the concluding verses of the *Bhikṣu Prātimokṣa* of the Lokottaravādins:⁸⁴

PDhp 62ab	<i>nāsti jhānam apramñassa / pramñā nāsti ajhāyato</i>
Dhp 372ab	<i>natthi jhānam apaññassa / paññā natthi ajhāyato</i>
GDhp 58ab	<i>nasti jaṇa aprañasa / prañā nasti ajayado</i>
Uv 32:25ab	<i>nāsty aprajñasya vai dhyānam / prajñā nādhyāyato 'sti ca</i>
<i>Prātimokṣa</i>	<i>nāsti dhyānam aprajñasya / prajñā nāsti adhyāyato.</i>

But since this verse is essentially the same in all versions, and since the source is not given, the citation simply proves that the Sāmmatiya canon also had the same verse.

⁸³ See Venkataramanan (1953) 153–243, with reference to *gāthās* on pp. 172, 185.

⁸⁴ Tatia (1975) 37.3.

Could the PDhp have been transmitted by the Sāmmatiyas? The traditions preserved in Tibetan on the languages of the four schools described above agree that the Sāmmatiyas did not use Sanskrit, and that they used a (Prakritic) language different from that of the Mahāsāṃghikas and the Sthaviras. This fits the language of the PDhp: it is certainly not Sanskrit; it is quite different from the Hybrid Sanskrit of the Lokottaravādins, and related to but different from the Pāli of the Sthaviras.

I have noted above that Roth describes the language of the PDhp as related to a western Prakrit and close to Pāli. von Hinüber (1989:365) comes to a similar conclusion, writing that “on the whole [the language of the PDhp] may be a western variety”, although he also suggests North-western and Eastern influence. The close relationship of the language of the PDhp to Pāli, and, along with it, Western India, suits a Sāmmatiya affiliation. The Vatsiputriyas, the “mother school” of the latter, were one of the earliest schools. Bhavya states that they were called Avantakas because they held a council at Avanti. The evidence Hsüantsang and I-ching shows that in the 7th century the Sāmmatiyas were predominant in Sindh, and well represented at Mālava and Valabhī. Bareau interprets the names of two branches, the Avantakas and Kurukulas, as referring to Avanti and Kurukṣetra.⁸⁵

The problem of the “Sendhapa Śrāvakas”

The predominance of the Sāmmatiyas in Western India raises the problem of the enigmatic “Sendhapa Śrāvakas”. Bu ston refers to a method of calculation of the years elapsed since the Parinirvāṇa according to the system of the Sendhapa Śrāvakas.⁸⁶ Tāranātha makes frequent

⁸⁵ Bareau (1955) 121–22.

⁸⁶ Bu ston 138.1, *rgya gar na ñan thos sen dha ba rnams*, Obermiller II 107.

reference to these Śrāvakas,⁸⁷ often in connection with Vajrāsana⁸⁸ and Odantapurī;⁸⁹ they were evidently quite active and numerous in North-eastern India during the Pāla-Sena period. If we derive Sendhapa from Saindhava, "belonging to Sindh", the term could refer to the Sāmmatiyas, who might have taken refuge in Magadha when Sindh fell to the Arabs, or simply have been described by the name of their "home country"⁹⁰ (as, from the 13th or 14th century, *bhikkhus* ordained in the reformed Theravāda in South-east Asia were said to belong to the Sihala-vāmsa). Some references imply that the name refers to a specific *nikāya*: Tāranātha mentions a Jñānaśrīmitra (late 10th century) who started out as a pāṇḍita of the Sendhapa Śrāvakas, and became proficient in the Tripitaka according to their system, before gaining faith in the

⁸⁷ Tāranātha, *History*, 168.13/279; 208.15/342; *Seven Instruction Lineages*, 609.1.2/42, 680.3/95; *Tārā Tantra* 523.5 = Templeman (1981) 18, Willson (1986) 182.

⁸⁸ Tāranātha, *History*, 193.9/319; *Tārā Tantra* 528.5 foll. = Templeman (1981) 22–23, Willson (1986) 186–87.

⁸⁹ Tāranātha, *History*, 175.5/289; *Seven Instruction Lineages*, 631.1/59.

⁹⁰ A stone pedestal inscription from the area of Bihar Sharif in Patna District, from the reign of Mahendrapāla (the Pratihāra ruler, late 9th century), records a dedication to the Saindhavas (*saindhavānām dānājārthe*, taking *saindhavānām* to be dative): Sastri (1942) 105–6; Huntington (1984) § 61, p. 240, and Fig. 39. Two inscriptions from Bodh Gaya record the setting up of Buddha images (*pratimā muneḥ*) by Śrī Dhārmabhima of Sindh (*sindhudbhavo*) during the time of Gopāladeva II (CE 940–960): Ramaranjan Mukherji and Sachindra Kumar Maity, *Corpus of Bengal Inscriptions bearing on History and Civilization of Bengal*, Calcutta, 1967, nos. 23 and 25; Huntington (1984) § 27 (pp. 218–20). I do not know whether the presence, with connections with Bodh Gaya, of ruling families claiming a Sindhu origin has any bearing on the presence of Saindhava monks (see D.C. Sircar in *EI* XXXV 82, n. 1). For a different interpretation of Sendhapa, based on the variant Penda ba, see D. Seyfort Ruegg, "Notes on some Indian and Tibetan Reckonings of the Buddha's Nirvāṇa and the Duration of his Teaching", in Heinz Bechert (ed.), *The Dating of the Historical Buddha*, Part 2, Göttingen, 1992, pp. 267–68 and nn.

Mahāyāna.⁹¹ Sometimes they opposed the Mahāyāna or Vajrayāna. While they are certainly Śrāvakas, the usage is otherwise not clear, and Tāranātha sometimes mentions Saindhava and Siñhala Śrāvakas in the same breath, as if they were equivalent.⁹² I do not know of any evidence in Theravādin literature of a relationship between the Sthaviras of Ceylon and those of Sindh, and I suspect that Tāranātha conflated two different groups of Śrāvakas. Siñhala might also be a mistaken reading of Saindhava. The question needs further investigation.⁹³

The Bhaikṣukī inscriptions

von Hinüber notes the existence of “epigraphical evidence of a language perhaps not too remote from that of the PDhp”.⁹⁴ These are inscriptions in the “Bhaikṣukī” (or “arrow-head” or “wedge-head”) script giving a brief prose canonical citation followed by the *ye dhammā* verse.⁹⁵ The text is known from seven inscriptions recovered from

⁹¹ Tāranātha, *History*, 183.17/302 *dañ por ñan thos sendha pa'i pañdi ta, de'i lugs kyi sde snod gsum la śin tu mkhas pa cig yin pa la*.

⁹² Tāranātha, *History* 168.14/279 *siṅga gliñ pa sogs ñan thos sendha pa*; *Seven Instruction Lineages*, 631.3/59 *sendha pa śin ga la man po*; *Tārā Tantra* 529.4 *singha la pa'i ñan thos sendha pa rnams*; 529.5 *siṅga gliñ pa'i ñan thos rnams* = Templeman (1981) 23, 37; Willson (1986) 186–87); 546.7 = Templeman (1981) 37; Willson (1986) 202. The latter passage describes Śākyarakṣita, who was born in Ceylon (*śin ga la'i yul*) and studied in Haribhūñja (Lamphun, North Thailand) as a *ñan thos sendha pa*. Here the term must be equivalent to Siñghala.

⁹³ So far as I know, the only scholars to identify Tāranātha's Saindhavas with the Sāmmatiyas have been R.C. Mitra, in his “The Decline of Buddhism in India”, *VBA* VI (1954), p. 84, and Willson (1986) 182 and n. 26, p. 396.

⁹⁴ von Hinüber (1989) 365, n. 62.

⁹⁵ “Bhaikṣukī *lipi*”, “the writing of *bhikṣus*”, was identified by Bendall as the script mentioned by al-Birūnī as “the writing of Buddha” used in Udunpūr in Pūrvadeśa—probably, according to Sircar, the Uḍḍandapura [or Odantapūrī] *vihāra* in Bihar Sharif near Patna. Sircar also notes that “although al-Birūnī seems to confine the use of the Bhaikṣukī script to the monks of

District Monghyr (Munger), Bihar—three from Uren⁹⁶ and one each from Ghoshikundi (near Kiul),⁹⁷ Kajra,⁹⁸ Badhauli,⁹⁹ and Gurdih.¹⁰⁰ There is also a dedication in the same script, from Maldah in West Bengal, that gives the same recension of the *ye dhammā* verse.¹⁰¹

Sircar dates the Uren inscriptions to “between the ninth and the twelfth century, preferably to the latter half of this period”; Bendall dates his inscriptions to between the 7th and 10th centuries, but given the similarity of the script to that of the other Bhaikṣuki records a later date is likely.¹⁰² The language of the records—described by Bendall as “differing

Uḍḍandapura...the discovery of the Kara inscription in the Allahabad District of the U.P. and that of...one in the Maldah District of West Bengal appear to suggest a wider distribution”. See *EI* XXVIII 222, 225.

⁹⁶ D.C. Sircar, “Four Bhaikshuki Inscriptions”, *EI* XXVIII 220–24. Inscription No. 1, dedicated by Śrī Pratinava Śrāda(vi)tapāla, is from “the base of a mutilated Buddhist image lying half buried by the side of the main road running through the village”. Sircar edited Inscriptions Nos. 2 and 3—which were on unspecified (stone?) “images”, the present whereabouts of which are unknown—from photographs published by L.A. Waddell in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* LXI (1892), Part i, Plate IV, Nos. 1 and 2 (not seen). For Uren see Sircar’s remarks and Patil (1963) 583–86.

⁹⁷ Edited from impressions by D.C. Sircar, “Bhaikshuki Inscription in Indian Museum”, *EI* XXXV 79–84: on the pedestal of an image of Jambhala dedicated by *bhadanta* Jayasena. For Kiul see Patil (1963) 209–10.

⁹⁸ *EI* XXXV, p. 84, Postscript, described as “on the lower part of a sculptured stone slab under a pipal tree near the Kajra railway station”.

⁹⁹ Bendall (1895) 153. The accompanying plate shows that the text is inscribed along the top of a sculptured stone base. Oddly enough, although Sircar (*EI* XXVIII 222, n. 1) refers to Bendall’s article, he does not mention that this and the following inscription give the same text as his inscriptions.

¹⁰⁰ Bendall (1895) 154, edited from “an eye-copy of a longer inscription”. The nature of the inscribed object is not mentioned.

¹⁰¹ *EI* XXVIII 224–26: on the pedestal of an Avalokiteśvara image, dedicated by *bhadanta* Buddhapālita.

¹⁰² *EI* XXVIII:223; Bendall (1895) 155. Sircar suggests a mid-13th century date for the Jambhala inscription (*EI* XXXV:81). Although his reasoning—a

Continues...

in only a few details from the literary Pāli" and by Sircar as "Pāli which is, however, greatly influenced by Sanskrit"¹⁰³—is consistent, and indeed similar to that of the PDhp, as von Hinüber has noted. The *ye dhammā* verse differs from that of the Theravādins,¹⁰⁴ Mahāsāṃghikas,¹⁰⁵ and Sarvāstivādins.¹⁰⁶ We may note the following correspondences between the inscriptions and the Patna *Dhammapada* (Cone ed.):

<i>dhammā</i>	= PDhp <i>dhamma, passim</i>
<i>deśeti</i>	cp. PDhp 68b <i>deśanā</i> ; 36b, 363d <i>deśitam</i>
<i>prabhavā</i>	cp. PDhp 1c <i>praduṣṭa</i> , 2c <i>prasanna</i> , etc., and von Hinüber (1989) 362–63
<i>tesām</i>	PDhp 87d, 124a <i>tesām</i> ; cp. 5d, 6d, 74c, 244c, 266d <i>tesam</i>
<i>śamano</i>	= PDhp 196d, ¹⁰⁷ 235a, d, 236d, 239d <i>śamano</i> .

The same reasoning that has been applied above to the PDhp may be applied to the inscriptions: since they present a canonical passage in a unique and consistent form of Middle Indic, they must come from the

fascinating *vylet* that sets out from an obscure section of the dedicatory part inscription itself—seems somewhat speculative, that the image should date to that period it is not in itself impossible.

¹⁰³ Bendall (1895) 153; *EI* XXVIII 223.

¹⁰⁴ *Vinaya* (PTS) I 40.28.

¹⁰⁵ Radhagovinda Basak (ed., with Bengali translation), *Mahāvastu Avadāna*, Vol. III, Calcutta, 1968 (Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series LXIII), p. 83.3 (= Senart, 62.8); *Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya* in Roth (1970) 333.9; *Abhisamācārikā* (ed. B. Jinānanda, Patna, 1969, TSWS IX, 230.6); *Prātimokṣa* in Tatia (1975) 38.3.

¹⁰⁶ *Catuspariṣat-sūtra* (ed. Waldschmidt) 28c6.

¹⁰⁷ The reference at von Hinüber & Norman under Dhp 142 should be corrected from PDhp 16 to 196.

canon of one of the Buddhist schools.¹⁰⁸ The similarity of the language to that of the PDhp suggests that they belong to the same school as that text, the Sāmmatiyas, and in this case we have corroborating evidence. Hsüan-tsang visted a country between Nālandā and Champā called I-lan-na-po-fa-to, bordered by the Ganges River in the north and mountains in the south.¹⁰⁹ It possessed ten *saṃghārāmas* with about 4000 monks, most of whom belonged to the Sāmmatiya school.¹¹⁰ There were a number of sacred sites in the region, which Cunningham and Waddell identified

¹⁰⁸ It would be interesting to see whether there are any other *ye dhammā* inscriptions in the same language. The verse appearing on ten terracotta plaques from Nālandā seems the same: see Simon D. Lawson, *A Catalogue of Indian Buddhist Clay Sealings in British Museums* (thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Oxford, 1982), pp. 429–39. I suspect there are others (see Lawson, pp. 153–54, for a tablet from Bodh Gaya in a language closer to Pāli). It is unfortunate that few scholars take the trouble to transcribe the verse; they regularly dismiss it as “the usual Buddhist creed”, thereby depriving us of a body of examples that would allow us to classify its forms. Sircar (*EJ* XXVIII 221), for example, remarks that he “took impressions of altogether fourteen image inscriptions at Uren, many of which, however, contained nothing but the Buddhist formula *ye dhammā*, etc.” At Kiul Cunningham uncovered several thousands of lac seals with the figure of the Buddha, mostly inscribed with “the usual Buddhist creed formula in 10th or 11th century characters” (Patil 1963:209–10). (There is one other very brief “canonical” Bhaikṣuki inscription: a dedication “in correct Sanskrit” on a metal plate meant to fit into the base of an image, from Kara in Allahabad District, which opens with the phrase *nāmarūpam anityam*: *EJ* XXII 37–39).

¹⁰⁹ Julien’s restoration of the name as Hirānyaparvata (Golden Mountain) was rejected by Watters (1904–5, II 179), who suggested Īrāṇaparvata.

¹¹⁰ Beal (1884) II 186–91; Watters (1904–5) II 178–81; Bagchi (1959) 102–3. Not long before Hsüan-tsang’s visit, a “king of a border country” had seized power, and “built in the city two *saṃghārāmas*, each holding something less than 1000 priests. Both of them are attached to the Sarvāstivādin school”. Since the language of the inscriptions is not that of the Sarvāstivādins, the existence of these monasteries does not affect our argument. The report is interesting in that it suggests that different schools may have vied for the favour of rulers.

with the ruins in the area of Uren.¹¹¹ On the evidence of our peripatetic pilgrim, I-lan-na-po-fa-to seems to have been the main Sāmmatiya centre south of the Ganges, and to have boasted the largest concentration of monks of that school in Madhyadeśa after Vārāṇasī (which had 4500 monks, including those in Sarnath).¹¹² If one examines the pilgrim's itinerary, there can be little doubt that the identification of the extensive Uren sites—which are all close together, within a radius of ten miles¹¹³—with I-lan-na-po-fa-to is correct. We may therefore conclude that the Sāmmatiyas were responsible for the inscriptions, and that the language is that of their canon: that is, that Monghyr District was indeed the major Sāmmatiya centre (and as a corollary Maldah in West Bengal might have had a least one Sāmmatiya *vihāra*).¹¹⁴ Religious activity continued at Uren up to at least the reign of Rāmapāla (late 11th or early 12th century).¹¹⁵ One can only agree with Patil when he says, "The place does not seem to

¹¹¹ See Sircar (*EI* XXVIII) and Patil (1963) 278–79; 583–86.

¹¹² See *HBI* 599 (Vārāṇasī 3000 + Sarnath 1500) (= Beal 1884 II 44–45; Watters 1904–5 II 46–48; Bagchi 1959:71–72); Bareau (1955) 36.

¹¹³ Sircar (*EI* XXVIII:220–21) states that Uren is about seven miles from Kiul and 2 1/2 miles from Kajra. Bendall (1895:153–54) places Badhuli about five miles south-west of Uren, and Gurdih about ten miles south-west of Uren and opposite Husainpur on the Kiul River. Unfortunately Uren was blasted for railway materials and otherwise plundered by the end of the 19th century. Sircar (*EI* XXVIII) relates the sad tale of its fate.

¹¹⁴ Maldah would seem to have been in Pundravardhana, which possessed about twenty *saṃghārāmas* with some 3000 monks who studied both the Hinayāna and Mahāyāna: Beal (1884) II 194–95; Watters (1904–5) II 184–85; Bagchi (1959) 104. It was also near Karṇasuvarṇa, which had ten *saṃghārāmas* with about 2000 monks of the Sāmmatiya school: Beal (1884) II 201–4; Watters (1904–5) II 191–93; Bagchi (1959) 106. For Pundravardhana, see Dilip K. Chakrabarti, *Ancient Bangladesh: A Study of the Archaeological Sources*, Delhi, 1992, pp. 22–23.

¹¹⁵ See for example the dedications at Huntington (1984) §§ 46, 48, pp. 231–33. These should be the inscriptions referred to by Sircar (*EI* XXVIII:221), especially the second, which agrees in dating from year 14 of Rāmapāla's reign.

have been examined by any archaeologist afterwards [since the end of the 19th century] and considering the large number of inscriptions and inscribed images, as reported by Waddell, further...exploration is certainly necessary".¹¹⁶

Another canonical inscription that may be mentioned here is the *pratīyasamutpāda* inscription from Devnimori in Gujarat.¹¹⁷ Although the relationship to the language of the PDhp is not as close as that of the Monghyr inscriptions, it does bear some resemblance. Furthermore, as it probably dates from the late 4th or early 5th century, it is centuries older than either of the former. Once again, we meet with a "new" canonical Middle Indic that must be that of a particular school. Since Gujarat was one of the strongholds of the Sāmmatīyas, the inscription may represent an earlier phase of their canon, or that of their predecessors, the Vātsīputriyas. The Sāmmatīya *Āgama* cited by Daśabalaśrīmitra relates that the school held several councils (*saṃgīti*). At these councils, the language of the canon might well have been revised: the Devnimori inscription might be drawn from an earlier recension of their canon, the PDhp and the Monghyr inscriptions from a later recension.¹¹⁸

9. Conclusions

The PDhp, transmitted in a distinct dialect of Buddhist Prakrit (or, less felicitously, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit), must have belonged to the canon of a Buddhist school. There is sufficient linguistic and textual evidence to

¹¹⁶ Patil (1963) 586.

¹¹⁷ See von Hinüber (1985).

¹¹⁸ von Hinüber (1985:193 foll.) deals with a second *pratīyasamutpāda* inscription from the 5th century from Ratnagiri in Orissa. The language is much closer to Pāli, and does not show any of the unique features of our inscriptions or the PDhp. The school affiliation of this inscription warrants further study.

eliminate as candidates three of the four main schools of the Madhyadeśa of the period of the manuscript (11th to 12th century): the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādins, and the Sthaviras. The remaining “lesser” schools and sub-schools may also be eliminated: either they had a limited geographical reach, or they did not survive into our period (in most cases both). By this process of elimination, the most likely candidate becomes the fourth of the four main schools, the Sāmmatiyas. The description of the canonical language of the Sāmmatiyas in Indo-Tibetan tradition as other than Sanskrit and different from that of the other schools suits the language of the PDhp. The Sāmmatiya ordination lineage was still active during the period of the PDhp manuscript (and indeed beyond), and Sāmmatiya texts were available in the library used by Daśabalaśrīmitra. The inscriptions from Uren, a major Sāmmatiya centre at the time of Hsüan-tsang, are in a similar language, and should also belong to the Sāmmatiyas.¹¹⁹

The information presented in this article gives rise to a number of general reflections about the Sāmmatiyas, beyond the question of the affiliation of the PDhp. Many of the Buddhist monuments of India, particularly of Gujarat and Sindh, but also of Madhyadeśa, were undoubtedly Sāmmatiya centres. We must therefore recognize that that school played a significant role in the development of Buddhist art and architecture, and keep our eyes open for inscriptions, including the *ye*

¹¹⁹ Although Tāraṇātha’s *History* states that the Vātsīputrīyas survived beyond our period, this is probably an anachronism: in their own *Āgama*, the Sāmmatiyas describe themselves as successors to that school. Tāraṇātha mentions the existence of another branch, the Kaurukullas, whose existence is confirmed by the colophon of Ārya Vimuktisena’s *Abhisamayālaṅkāra-vṛtti*, in Sanskrit and Tibetan. Since the colophon refers to the Kaurukulla-ārya-sāmmatiyas, the Kaurukullas were certainly Sāmmatiyas. There is no evidence that this branch, or perhaps, as Bareau suggests, geographical division, existed at the time of the PDhp manuscript.

dhammā verse, that may be related to the Sāmmatiyas. From the time of Ārya Vimuktisena, monks ordained in the Sāmmatiya lineage practised Mahāyāna, and from the Pāla-Sena period up to the 15th century, monks ordained in the Sāmmatiya lineage practised Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna. That is—and this is already quite clear from the statements of the Chinese pilgrims and from Tibetan sources—the Mahāyāna was not restricted to any single *nikāya*, and all four *nikāyas* participated in the development of Mahāyāna thought and practice.

The original draft of this article, written some years ago, ended here. I was not aware that Kōgen Mizuno had already independently concluded that the PDhp belonged to the Sāmmatiyas, for entirely different reasons. He writes: "The *nikāya* (school) which transmitted this *Dharmapada* is entirely unknown, but judging from the linguistic features, the language of the words and phrases of this *Dharmapada* seems to correspond to the transliteration of various technical terms concerning Vinaya which appear in the *Vinaya-dvāvirñśati-prasannārtha-śāstra* (Nanjio 1139, Taishō Vol. 24, pp. 665–73) translated by Paramārtha in CE 568. Since this Vinaya text is regarded as a sacred book of the Sammitiya-vāda, it seems to me that this *Dharmapada* was transmitted by the same school."¹²⁰ If Mizuno's

¹²⁰ Mizuno (1984) 168 (I have corrected the misprinted *-prasammārtha-* to *-prasannārtha-*, after Nanjio's Sanskrit form of the title of the work referred to above as the **Vinayadvāvirñśatividyā-śāstra*). Mizuno remarks that in the other Sāmmatiya text preserved in Chinese, the **Sāmmatiyanikāya-śāstra*, "no linguistic distinction is shown", and refers to his "Study of the SDHP" [= PDhp] in *Buddhist Studies XI*, Hamamatsu City, 1982, pp. 1–48 (not seen). Lin Li-kouang (1949:206) reached a similar conclusion regarding the *Sāmmatiyanikāya-śāstra*, noting that it contains over fifty transcriptions, which do not offer any conclusive information about the original language, except that "l'original...comptait des mots dénotent une tendance au moyen-indien, comme on en trouve dans tant d'autres textes".

findings can be confirmed, the Sāmmatiya affiliation of the PDhp becomes more than a hypothesis.

Nandapuri

Peter Skilling

Sources

In referring to Tibetan works and their translations, I give first the page and line number of the Tibetan text and then, separated by a stroke, the page number of the translation.

Abbreviations

BA	<i>Deb ther sñon po</i> of 'Gos lo tsa ba gñon nu dpal, Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khañ, Chengdu, 1984; English translation in Roerich (1949)
BSR	<i>Buddhist Studies Review</i> (London)
Dhp	Pāli <i>Dhammapada</i> : see von Hinüber & Norman (1994)
DPPN	G.P. Malalasekera, <i>Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names</i> , [1937] New Delhi, 1983
EI	<i>Epigraphia Indica</i>
JPTS	<i>Journal of the Pāli Text Society</i>
GDhp	Gāndhāri <i>Dharmapada</i> : see Brough (1962)
HBI	Étienne Lamotte, <i>Histoire du bouddhisme indien des origines à l'ère Śaka</i> , [Louvain, 1958] Louvain-la-Neuve, 1976
KBC	Lewis R. Lancaster with Sung-bae Park, <i>The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue</i> , Berkeley, 1979
Mvy	R. Sakaki (ed.), <i>Mahāvyutpatti</i> , 2 vols., Kyōto, 1926

PDhp	Patna <i>Dhammapada</i> : see Shukla (1979), Roth (1980), Cone (1989), Mizuno (1990)
PTS	roman script Pali Text Society edition
TSWS	Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series (Patna)
Uv	<i>Udānavarga</i> : see Bernhard (1965)
VBA	<i>Visva-Bharati Annals</i> (Santiniketan)

Authors

Bagchi (1959): Prabodh Chandra Bagchi (tr.), *She-kia-fang-che*, Santiniketan

Balk (1984): Michael Balk (ed.), *Prajñāvarman's Udānavargavivaraṇa*, 2 vols., Bonn, (Indica et Tibetica, Arbeitsmaterialen A)

Balk (1988): Michael Balk, *Untersuchungen zum Udānavarga*, Bonn

Bareau (1955): André Bareau, *Les sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*, Paris

Beal (1878): Samuel Beal, *Texts from the Buddhist Canon, Commonly known as Dhammapada, with accompanying Narratives*, Boston (repr. San Francisco, 1977)

Beal (1884): Samuel Beal, *Si-yu-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World*, London (repr. Delhi, 1981)

Bechert (1980): Heinz Bechert (ed.), *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, Göttingen (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, II)

Bechert (1985): Heinz Bechert (ed.), *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, Erster Teil, Göttingen (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III, 1)

Bendall (1895): Cecil Bendall, "On Pali Inscriptions from Magadha (Behar)", *Actes du Dixième Congrès International des Orientalistes. Session de Genève, 1894*, deuxième partie, Leiden, pp. 153–56

Bernhard (1965, 1968): Franz Bernhard (ed.), *Udānavarga*, Band I, Göttingen, 1965; Band II, Göttingen 1968 (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden X)

Brough (1962): John Brough (ed.), *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London (London Oriental Series, Vol. 7)

Cone (1989): Margaret Cone (ed.), "Patna Dharmapada", *JPTS* XIII (1989) 101–217

Dietz & Zongtse (1990): Siglinde Dietz & Champa Thupten Zongtse, *Udānavarga*, Band III (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden X, 3)

von Hinüber (1985): Oskar von Hinüber, "Epigraphical Varieties of Continental Pāli from Devnimori and Ratnagiri", in *Buddhism and its Relation to Other Religions: Essays in Honour of Dr. Shozen Kumoi on his Seventieth Birthday*, Kyoto, pp. 185–200

von Hinüber (1989): Oskar von Hinüber, "Origin and Varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit", in Colette Caillat (ed.), *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, Paris, pp. 341–67.

von Hinüber & Norman (1994): O. von Hinüber & K.R. Norman, *Dhammapada*, Pali Text Society, Oxford

Huntington (1984): Susan L. Huntington, *The "Pāla-Sena" Schools of Sculpture*, Leiden (Studies in South Asian Culture X)

Joshi (1977): Lal Mani Joshi, *Studies in the Buddhist Culture of India during the Seventh and Eighth Centuries A.D.*, 2nd revised ed., 1977 (repr. 1987)

Lessing & Wayman (1968): Ferdinand D. Lessing & Alex Wayman (ed., tr.), *Mkhas grub rje's Fundamentals of the Buddhist Tantras: Rgyud*

sde spyiḥi rnam par gžag pa rgyas par brjod, Mouton, The Hague (Indo-Iranian Monographs VIII)

Lévi (1912): Sylvain Lévi, "L'Apramāda-varga. Étude sur les recensions des Dharmapadas", *Journal Asiatique*, septembre-octobre 1912, pp. 203–94

Lin Li-kouang (1949): Lin Li-kouang, *L'Aide-mémoire de la vraie loi (Saddharma-smṛtyupasthāna-sūtra): Recherches sur un Sūtra Développé du Petit Véhicule*, Paris

Mizuno (1979): Kōgen Mizuno, "Dharmapadas of Various Buddhist Schools", in A.K. Narain & L. Zwilling (eds.), *Studies in Pali and Buddhism, A Memorial Volume in Honor of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap*, Delhi, pp. 255–67

Mizuno (1984): Kōgen Mizuno, "A Comparative Study of Dharmapadas", in Gatare Dhammapala, Richard Gombrich, & K.R. Norman (eds.), *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Hammalava Saddhātissa*, Nupegoda, pp. 168–75

Mizuno (1990): Kōgen Mizuno, "A Study of the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit *Dharmapada*" (II), *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)* XIX (March, 1990)

Nakatani (1984): Hideaki Nakatani, "Remarques sur la transmission des Dharmapada", *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 2, pp. 135–51

Nakatani (1987): H. Nakatani, *Udānavarga de Subaśi*, Paris

Norman (1989): K.R. Norman, "Notes on the Patna *Dharmapada*", in N.H. Samtani and H.S. Prasad (eds.), *Amalā Prajñā: Aspects of Buddhist Studies* (Professor P.V. Bapat Felicitation Volume), Delhi, pp. 431–44

Obermiller (1932): E. Obermiller (tr.), *History of Buddhism (Chos-hbyung) by Bu-ston*, II. Part, *The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet*, Heidelberg

Patil (1963): D.R. Patil, *The Antiquarian Remains in Bihar*, Patna

Robinson (1979): James B. Robinson (tr.), *Buddha's Lions: The Lives of the Eighty-Four Siddhas, Caturaśīti-siddha-pravṛtti by Abhayadatta*, Berkeley

Rockhill (1883): W. Woodville Rockhill (tr.), *Udānavarga: A Collection of Verses from the Buddhist Canon*, London (repr. Taipei, 1972)

Roerich (1949): George N. Roerich (tr.), *The Blue Annals*, [Calcutta, 1949] Delhi, 1976

Roth (1970): Gustav Roth (ed.), *Bhiksuni-Vinaya, Manual of Discipline for Buddhist Nuns*, K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna (TSWS XII)

Roth (1980): Gustav Roth, "Text of the Patna Dharmapada", supplement to "Particular Features of the Language of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins and their Importance for Early Buddhist Tradition", in Bechert (1980) 97–135

Roth (1985): Gustav Roth, "The Readings *Madhy'-uddeśika*, *Madhyoddeśika*, and *Madhyadeśika* in the Scriptures of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins including Notes on *daśa-baddhena* and *pañca-baddhena ganena*", in Bechert (1985) 127–37

Sastri (1942): Hiranand Sastri, *Nalanda and its Epigraphic Material*, [Delhi, 1942] Delhi, 1986 (ASI Memoir No. 66)

Schmithausen (1970): Lambert Schmithausen, "Zu den Rezensionen des *Udānavargah*", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* XIV, pp. 47–124

Shukla (1979): N.S. Shukla (ed.), *The Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dharmapada*, K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna (TSWS XIX)

Skilling (1982): Peter Skilling, “History and Tenets of the Sāmmatiya School”, “Linh-Son”—*Publication d'études bouddhologiques* 19 (juin/septembre 1982) 38–52

Skilling (1987): Peter Skilling, “The Saṃskṛtasaṃskṛtaviniścaya of Daśabalaśrīmitra, BSR 4/1 (1987) 3–23

Skilling (1993): Peter Skilling, “Theravādin Literature in Tibetan Translation”, *JPTS* XIX, pp. 69–201

Takakusu (1896): J. Takakusu (tr.), *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (AD 671–695)*, by I-tsing, [London, 1896] New Delhi, 1982

Tāraṇātha, *History*: Antonius Schieffner, *Tāraṇāthae de Doctrinae Buddhicae in India Propagatione*, St. Petersburg, 1868; Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya (ed.), *Tāraṇātha's History of Buddhism in India*, [1970] Calcutta, 1980

Tāraṇātha: *bKa' babs bdun ldan gyi brgyud pa'i rnam thar no mtshar rmad du byuñ ba'i rin po che'i khuñs lta bu'i gtam*, from Tāraṇātha's *Collected Works*, Vol. *ma*; English translation in Templeman (1983)

Tāraṇātha: *sGrol ma'i rgyud kyi byuñ khuñs gsal bar byed pa'i lo rgyus gser gyi phren ba*, from Tāraṇātha's *Collected Works*, Vol. *na*; English translation in Templeman (1981) and Willson (1986)

Tatia (1975): Nathmal Tatia (ed.), *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādimahāsāṅghika School*, Patna (TSWS 16)

Templeman (1981): David Templeman (tr.), *The Origin of the Tārā Tantra*, Dharamsala

Templeman (1983): David Templeman (tr.), *Tāraṇātha's Bka'. babs. bdun. ldan: The Seven Instruction Lineages*, Dharamsala

Thich Thien Chau (1987): Thich Thien Chau, "Les réponses des Pudgalavādin aux critiques des écoles bouddhiques", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 10/1, pp. 33–53

Venkataramanan (1953): K. Venkataramanan (tr.), "Sāmmitīyanikāya Śāstra", *VBA* V

Vogel (1985): Claus Vogel, "Bu-ston on the Schism of the Buddhist Church and on the Doctrinal Tendencies of Buddhist Scriptures", in Bechert (1985) 104–10

Wang (1994): Bangwei Wang, "Buddhist Nikāyas through Ancient Chinese Eyes", in *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-funden, Beiheft 5, Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur*, Göttingen, pp. 165–203

Watters (1904–5): Thomas Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India (A.D. 629–645)*, London (repr. New Delhi, 1973)

Willemen (1973): Charles Willemen, "The Prefaces to the Chinese Dharmapadas, Fa-chü ching and Ch'u-yao ching", *T'oung Pao* LIX, pp. 203–19

Willemen (1974): Charles Willemen, *Dharmapada: A Concordance to Udānavarga, Dharmapada, and the Chinese Dharmapada Literature*, Brussels

Willemen (1978): Charles Willemen, *The Chinese Udānavarga: A Collection of Important Odes of the Law, Fa Chi Yao Sung Ching*, Brussels (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques XIX)

Willson (1986): Martin Willson, *In Praise of Tārā: Songs to the Saviouress*, London

Yuyama (1980): Akira Yuyama, "Bu-ston on the Languages Used by Indian Buddhists at the Schismatic Period", in Bechert (1980) 175–81

New Pāli Inscriptions from South-east Asia

I. A RECENTLY DISCOVERED PĀLI INSCRIPTION FROM NAKHON PATHOM¹

In October 1991 the Institute of Western Thai Culture, Silpakorn University, held an exhibition on "The Archaeological Sites in Western Thailand" at the Sanamchandra Palace, Nakhon Pathom. The exhibition catalogue included a brief note, in Thai and English, accompanied by photographs, on a "New inscription found from Dvāravatī site in Western Thailand".¹ A reading of the inscription, with a Thai translation, was published in the same year by Naiyana Prongthura *et al.*, with larger and clearer plates.² According to the latter, the inscription was presented to Silpakorn University, Sanamchandra Palace Campus, by the abbot of Wat Taku (Amphoe Muang, Nakhon Pathom) in BE 2532 [CE 1989]. The abbot received it from a villager from district Nakhon Chaisi (Nakhon Pathom province); no further details regarding the nature of the find-spot or the date of discovery are available.

* An earlier version of this article was published under the title "Preliminary Report on a Recently Discovered Pāli Inscription" in the *Journal of the Office of the Supreme Patriarch's Secretary (Warasanchotmaikhao Samnaklekhuanukan-somdetphrasangharat)*, Vol. I, No. 1, (2535 [1992]), pp. 83–86. The earlier version was based only on the "exhibition catalogue" (see n. 1); the present revision takes into account the work of Naiyana *et al.* (see n. 2), and gives an improved reading of the inscription and some additional references.

¹ Phasook Indrawooth *et al.*, *Laeng boranakhadi nai phumiphak tawantok / The Archaeological Sites in Western Thailand*, Silpakorn University Press, Nakhon Pathom, 1991, pp. 112–13 and Pl. 67.

² Naiyana Prongthura *et al.*, "An inscription on a rectangular bar in the Pallava script in the Cultural Project Centre, Silpakorn University, Sanamchandra Palace Campus, Nakhon Pathom" (in Thai), in *Phasa-Charuk*, Part 3, published in celebration of the sixth cycle of Prof. Dr. Prasert Na Nagara, Silpakorn University, Bangkok, 2534 [1991], pp. 40–44.

The text is neatly engraved in ornate Pallava characters on a rectangular stone bar measuring 30.7 by 5.2 cm., with two lines on each of the four long sides. The exhibition catalogue dates the inscription to the 12th century BE [*circa* 550–650 CE], and notes that it bears ‘the essence of the Buddha’s Teaching: Ariyasacca (The Four Noble Truths) and Paṭiccasamuppāda (The Law of Causation)’. Naiyana dates the inscription to the 12–13th century BE [*circa* 550–750 CE].

1. Transcription

The transcription given here follows the order in which the photographs occur in the exhibition catalogue and that given by Naiyana *et al.*, with the four sides of the bar numbered from A to D.

- A.1. *śrī // dukkha samudaya nirodha magga avijjā saṃkhāra viññāna nāmarūpa*
- A.2. *salāyatana phassa vedanā taṇhā upādāna bhava jāti jarā marana //*
- B.1. *cattāro satipaṭṭhānā cattāro saṃmappadhānā cattāro iddhipādā pañcindriyāni*
- B.2. *pañcabalāni satta bojjhaṅgā ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo sattatiñsa bodhipakkhiyadhamma³*
- C.1. *abhiññeyyam abhiññātām bhāvetavañca bhāvitam*
- C.2. *pahātavvam pahīnam me tasmā buddho 'smi brāhmaṇa //*
- D.1. *dukkham dukkhasamuppādaṁ dukkhassa ca atikkamaṁ ariyañ caṭṭhaṅgikam maggam dukkhūpasamagāmina[m] //*
- D.2. *iti buddho abhiññāya dhammam akkhāsi bhikkhūnam dukkhass' antakaro satthā cakkhumā parinibbuto //*

³ It is not clear whether the stone reads *-a* or *-ā*.

2. Discussion

A) Side A may be divided into two parts. The first lists the four Truths of the Noble Ones (*ariya-sacca*), from *dukkha*, suffering, to *magga*, the path; the second lists the twelve links of dependent arising (*paṭiccasamuppāda*), from *avijjā*, ignorance, to *jarā-marana*, ageing-and-death.

The four Truths of the Noble Ones are given in an inscription from Sārnāth in India⁴ and in a number of inscriptions from Siam.⁵ From an early but as yet undetermined date, it was a practice to place the inscribed text of dependent arising within or upon *thūpas* or *cetiyas*, as shown by numerous inscriptions in Pāli, Prakrit, Sanskrit, and Chinese, from India, Siam, Burma, Malaya, Java, and Central Asia.⁶

B) Side B lists the “37 factors conducive to enlightenment” (*bodhipakkhiya-dhamma*) in seven groups in ascending numerical order:

- the 4 foundations of mindfulness (*cattāro satipaṭṭhānā*);
- the 4 right efforts (*cattāro sammapadadhānā*);
- the 4 bases of success (*cattāro iddhipādā*);

⁴ See Sten Konow, “Two Buddhist Inscriptions from Sārnāth”, *Epigraphia Indica* IX (1907–08), § 43.

⁵ See Peter Skilling, “A Buddhist Verse Inscription from Andhra Pradesh”, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 34 (1991), pp. 239–46, especially p. 244 and notes thereto, and Part II of the present article.

⁶ For references see Oskar von Hinüber, “Epigraphical Varieties of Continental Pāli from Devnimori and Ratnagiri”, in *Buddhism and its Relation to Other Religions: Essays in Honour of Dr. Shozan Kumoi on His Seventieth Birthday, Kyoto*, 1985, pp. 185–200. For Java see J.G. de Casparis, *Prasasti Indonesia* II, Bandung, 1956, § III; for Central Asia, see Hubert Durt *et al.* “A propos de ‘stūpa miniatures’ votifs du Ve siècle découverts à Tourfan et au Gansu”, *Arts asiatiques* 40 (1985), pp. 92–106.

the 5 faculties (*pañcindriyāni*);
 the 5 powers (*pañcabalāni*);
 the 7 factors of awakening (*satta bojjhaṅgā*);
 the noble eightfold path (*ariyo aṭṭhangiko maggo*).

The same list is given in the Pyu script of Śrikuṭṭa on one of the gold plates from “Khin Ba’s Mound” at Hmawza in Prome District, Burma.⁷ The only difference is that the present inscription concludes with the general title “37 factors conducive to enlightenment” (*sattatiṅsa bodhipakkhiyadhammā*), not given in the Pyu version.

C) Side C gives a single verse:

I have realized what is to be realized;
 I have cultivated what is to be cultivated;
 I have abandoned what is to be abandoned:
 therefore, O brāhmaṇa, I am a Buddha.

The verse, spoken by the Buddha to the brāhmaṇa Sela, occurs in the *Sela-sutta* of the *Mahāvagga* of the *Sutta-nipāta* (v. 558) and in the verses of the Elder Sela in the *Viśati-nipāta* of the *Theragāthā* (v. 828). It also occurs in the *Brahmāyu-sutta* in the *Brāhmaṇa-vagga* of the *Majjhima-nikāya* (sutta 91, Vol. II 143.29), spoken by the Buddha to the brāhmaṇa Brahmāyu. Buddhaghosa (5th century) cites the verse for the definition of *sambuddha* in his *Visuddhimagga*.⁸ A partial Lokottaravādin counterpart occurs (in a corrupt state?) in the *Mahāvastu*, spoken to the Ājivaka Upaka by the Buddha shortly after his

⁷ U Tha Myat, *Pyu Reader*, Rangoon, 1963, Pl. VI 1–3, pp. 26, 30.

⁸ Henry Clarke Warren (ed.), Dharmananda Kosambi (rev.), *Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosācariya* (Harvard Oriental Series 41) [Cambridge, Mass., 1950] Delhi, 1989, p. 166.11.

enlightenment.⁹ Mūlasarvāstivādin parallels occur in the *Verses of Kaineya* in the *Bhaisajyavastu* of the *Vinaya* of that school, as preserved in Sanskrit and in Tibetan translation,¹⁰ and in a short sūtra preserved in Tibetan translation in Śamathadeva's precious commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa*.¹¹ The latter has close parallels in the *Tsa a han ching* (the “longer” Chinese *Samyuktāgama*, translated by Guṇabhadra between 435–43)¹² and in the *Pieh i tsa a han ching* (the “shorter” Chinese *Samyuktāgama*, an anonymous translation done during the Three Ch'in dynasties, 352–431).¹³ Bhavya (6th century) refers to the verse in his *Madhyamakahṛdaya-kārikās* for the first of three definitions of the word “Buddha”,¹⁴ and cites it in his commentary thereon, the *Tarkajvālā*,¹⁵ as

⁹ *Mahāvastu* III 327,2 n. 9.

¹⁰ *Kaineya-gāthā*, in Nalinaksha Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III–1, [Srinagar, 1947] Delhi, 1984, p. 268.19; *Ke na'i bu'i tshigs su bcad pa, sMan gyi gzi*, Peking Tibetan *Tripiṭaka* § 1030, Vol. 41, 'dul ba ña, 218b4. The relationship between the *Kaineya-gāthā* and the better known *Śaila-gāthā*—frequently mentioned in (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin literature—or *Sela-sutta*, which share a number of verses, remains to be determined (cp. *Bhaisajyavastu* 275.4–12 with *Sutta-nipāta* vv. 549–54 and *Bhaisajyavastu* 277, penult–278, ult with *Sutta-nipāta* vv. 559–64).

¹¹ *Upāyikā Tīkā* on the *Abhidharmakośa*, Peking Tibetan *Tripiṭaka* § 5595, Vol. 118, *miñon pa tu*, 2b6.

¹² Taishō 99, no. 100 (Vol. 2, 28a); see Lewis R. Lancaster in collaboration with Sung-bae Park, *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue*, Berkeley, 1979, § 650, Ch. (4) 13.

¹³ Taishō 100, no. 266 (Vol. 2, 467a); *Korean Buddhist Canon* § 651, No. 13.17. I am grateful to J.-U. Hartmann (Berlin) for checking the Chinese sources.

¹⁴ Ch. 3, v. 268: see Malcom David Eckel, *To See the Buddha: a Philosopher's Quest for the Meaning of Emptiness*, San Francisco, 1992, p. 159 and p. 224, n. 10.

¹⁵ Translated in Eckel, *loc. cit.*

well as in his *Prajñāpradīpa*¹⁶ and *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa*.¹⁷ Kamalaśīla (circa 740–95) also cites the verse, with variants, in his *Pañjikā* on Śāntarakṣita's *Tattvasaṅgraha*.¹⁸

The verse is known from another inscription from Ban Phrom Din, Tambon Lum Khao, Amphoe Khok Samrong, Lop Buri, published with photographs in *Ancient Inscriptions from the Early Period Found in Lop Buri and Vicinity* and in *Inscriptions of Thailand*, Vol. I.¹⁹ The inscription, found by a farmer while ploughing his fields, is in a somewhat cursive and less ornate Pallava, but otherwise the form of the characters is close to that of the present inscription. The editors of the former work date it to the 14th century BE, those of the latter to the 13th to 14th centuries: that is, from about 650 to 850 CE. In both inscriptions the -vv- in place of the -bb- of “standard” Pāli is quite clear: in *bhāvetavvam* and *pahātavvam* in the Nakhon Chaisi inscription, and in *pahātavvam* in the Phrom Din inscription, which is fragmentary. That *va* and *ba* were distinguished in “Dvāravatī Pallava” may be easily seen by

¹⁶ See Christian Lindtner, “Materials for the Study of Bhavya”, in Eivind Kahrs (ed.), *Kalyāṇamitrārāgaṇam: Essays in Honour of Nils Simonsson*, Oslo, 1986, n. 23, p. 191.

¹⁷ Translated by Lindtner, *op. cit.*, p. 188. While Bhavya's authorship of the *Prajñāpradīpa* is not questioned, it is for the other two works. For this problem, see David Seyfort Ruegg, “On the Authorship of Some Works Ascribed to Bhāvaviveka/Bhavya”, in David Seyfort Ruegg and Lambert Schmithausen (ed.), *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*, Leiden, 1990, pp. 59–71, and also Eckel, p. 197, n. 1.

¹⁸ Swami Dwarikadas Shastri (ed.), *Tattvasaṅgraha of Ācārya Śāntarakṣita with the Commentary ‘Pañjikā’ of Shri Kamalashīla* (Buddha Bharati Series 2), Vol. 2, Varanasi, 1982, p. 1121.11. Cf. the translation in Ganganatha Jha, *The Tattvasaṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita with the Commentary of Kamalashīla*, Vol. II, [Baroda, 1939] Delhi, 1986, p. 1567.

¹⁹ *Charuk boran run raek phop ti lop buri lae klai khang*, Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2524 [1981], pp. 14–17; *Charuk nai prathet thai*, Vol. I, National Library-Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2529 [1986], pp. 237–40.

comparing the shape of the *va* with that of the *ba* in *buddha* in both inscriptions, and in several other places in the present inscription. Oskar von Hinüber has already noted the same peculiarity in a *dhammacakka* inscription from Nakhon Pathom—which carries the readings *pahātavvam*, *sacchikātavvam*, and *bhāvetavvam*—as well as in a later inscription from Lamphun.²⁰ The form also occurs in *veditavvo* in the “Maunggun plates” from near Hmawza in Burma.²¹ These texts offer further evidence for von Hinüber’s suggestion that “it does not seem to be altogether impossible that the Pāli of Dvāravatī differed in this respect [that is, using -vv- for -bb-] at least from standard Ceylonese Pāli”.

D) Side D contains two verses, one to each line. The first summarizes the four truths:

Suffering, the arising of suffering,
the transcendence of suffering,
and the noble eightfold path
that leads to the cessation of suffering.

The verse occurs frequently in Pāli: in the *Dhammapada* (v. 191), *Samyutta-nikāya* (II 185.23), *Itivuttaka* (17.22–18.2), *Theragāthā*

²⁰ “Epigraphical Varieties”, p. 186, referring to G. Coedès, “Une roue de la loi avec inscription en pāli provenant du site de P’ra Pathom”, in *Artibus Asiae* 19 (1966) pp. 221–26. The inscription has been published in *Charuk nai prathet thai*, Vol. I, pp. 59–64. The inscribed *dhammacakka* from Manorom district, Chai Nat, studied in Part II below has the form *sacchikātabba*, as read in *Boranakhadi Muang U Taphao* (Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2534 [1991], p. 180): this should be checked against the original. A Pāli *Vinaya* manuscript from Nepal has the form *ññāpetavvo*: see Oskar von Hinüber, *The Oldest Pāli Manuscript: Four Folios of the Vinaya-Piṭaka from the National Archives*, Kathmandu, Stuttgart, 1991, p. 9.

²¹ Louis Finot, “Un nouveau document sur le bouddhisme birman”, *Journal asiatique*, dixième série, tome XX (1912), p. 131.

(v. 1259), and *Therīgāthā* (vv. 186, 193, 310, 321). It occurs in Sanskrit in (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin literature: in the *Paśyavarga* of the *Udānavarga*, and, with variants, in the *Vidyāsthānopama-sūtra* and the *Prātihārya-sūtra* (of the *Divyāvadāna*); it is cited in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the *Vibhāṣāprabhā-vṛtti* on the *Abhidharma-dīpa*, and other treatises. In Tibetan translation it occurs in the *Kṣudraka-vastu* of the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins and in the *Dhvajāgra-sūtra* of the same school.²² In the *Āryamaitreya-vyākaraṇa* it is presented as the epitome of Maitreya's teaching:²³ thus it is a formula summarizing the teaching of the Buddhas. In a Sogdian eulogy dedicated to Avalokiteśvara it seems to have been used as a mantra.²⁴ The verse occurs three times in inscriptions: in a slightly Sanskritized Pāli from Guntupalle in Andhra Pradesh, and in Pāli from U Thong (Suphan Buri province) and in the present inscription from Nakhon Pathom.²⁵

The subject of the second verse is the Buddha:

Thus the Buddha, having realized [the truth]
taught the Dhamma to the monks;
the Teacher, who has put an end to suffering,
the one with vision, has realized full nibbāna.

²² For references see Skilling, "A Buddhist Verse Inscription", pp. 240–41. For the *Dhvajāgra-sūtra* version see P. Skilling, *Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha*, Vol. I, Oxford, 1994, pp. 306–7. The verse is discussed in further details in Vol. II of the same work (forthcoming).

²³ Nalinaksha Dutt (ed.), *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. IV, [Calcutta, 1959] Delhi, 1984, vv. 58cd–59ab (p. 203); Sylvain Lévi, "Maitreya le consolateur", in *Études d'orientalisme publiées par le Musée Guimet à la mémoire de Raymonde Linossier*, tome II, Paris, 1932, v. 60 (p. 387). I owe this reference to Gregory Schopen, "Hinayāna Texts in a 14th Century Persian Chronicle: Notes on Some of Rashīd al-Dīn's Sources", *Central Asiatic Journal* 26 (1982), pp. 228–35.

²⁴ E. Benveniste, *Textes Sogdiens édités, traduits et commentés* (Mission Pelliot en Asie centrale III, Paris, 1940, p. 113).

²⁵ For the first two see Skilling, "A Buddhist Verse Inscription".

The verse occurs once in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* (*Dīghanikāya* II 123.9) and twice in the *Ānguttara-nikāya* (II 2.3, IV 106.5). In all three cases it is spoken by the Buddha, following the verse:

Virtue, concentration, wisdom,
and the unsurpassed liberation:
these dhammas have been realized
by Gotama, the illustrious.²⁶

This is the first time that the verse has been noted in an inscription. The *itti* ("thus") with which it commences should refer to the preceding verse on the four Truths; thus the two verses of Side D seem to have been connected in the Dvāravatī tradition.

3. Conclusions

The present inscription is one of the most complete of the Dvāravatī *corpus*, which is made up of mostly fragmentary texts. It is a significant addition to our knowledge of the Buddhism of the Dvāravatī period. The language of the texts (with the exception of the opening Sanskrit *śrī*) is Pāli. The orthography (with the exception of the *-vv-* / *-bb-* discrepancy) agrees with that of the Pāli texts transmitted in Ceylon: indeed the verses of the inscription could have been taken from a modern printed edition of the canon, with scarcely a single variant.

The inscription confirms the preoccupation of the Dvāravatī Buddhists with what the exhibition catalogue has called "the essence of the Buddha's teaching". The four truths are given twice, in the bare list of A and in the verse of D. Dependent arising is given in A; it is also given

²⁶ *sīlam samādhi paññā ca vimutti ca anuttarā, anubuddhā ime dhammā gotamena yasassinā.*

in fuller form on at least one *dhammacakka*, and is represented by the numerous *ye dhammā* inscriptions from various sites. The Pyu of Śrīkṣetra also inscribed canonical texts on various materials, sometimes the same ones inscribed in Dvāravatī: dependent arising, the *ye dhammā* verse, and the 37 factors.²⁷ While such a practice is well attested in Burma and Siam, no contemporary canonical Pāli inscriptions have been found in Ceylon, where extensive excavations have taken place for over a century. It is astonishing that an article published in 1971 could list only three Pāli inscriptions for the whole of Ceylon, all later than those of Dvāravatī or Śrīkṣetra.²⁸ Examples of canonical inscriptions from South India are rare: I know of only the interesting trove of distinctive sealings in Pallava script from the Śaṅkaram Hills in Andhra Pradesh,²⁹ and the verse from Andhra mentioned above. Throughout Northern India the practice of inscribing the *ye dharma* verse and the *Discourse on Dependent Arising*, whether in Sanskrit or Prakrit, was widespread from at least the early Gupta period. This suggests that the early Buddhism of Burma and Siam had links with Northern India—the heartland of Magadha—which is only natural since such links may be seen throughout the historical period up to the present. On the basis of available evidence, the predominant school at both Dvāravatī and Śrīkṣetra seems to have been a form of Theravāda affiliated to that of

²⁷ For canonical citations from Burma, see Nihar-ranjan Ray, "Early Traces of Buddhism in Burma", *The Journal of the Greater India Society*, Vol. VI-1 (January, 1939), pp. 41–49, and G.H. Luce, "The Advent of Buddhism to Burma", in L. Cousins et al. (ed.), *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner*, Dordrecht and Boston, 1974, pp. 125–127.

²⁸ Malini Dias, "Sanskrit and Pali Inscriptions of Ceylon", in *Ancient Ceylon*, No. 1, January 1971, pp. 105–109.

²⁹ See A. Rea, "A Buddhist Monastery on the Śaṅkaram Hills, Vizagapatam District", *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report, 1907–8*, repr. Delhi, 1990, pp. 149–80 (especially pp. 169–72) and Pls. LVIII–LX. The inscriptions that I am able to decipher from the rather murky reprint give the *ye dharma* verse in Sanskrit.

India—whether of the North, of Andhra Pradesh, or several regions together—as well as to that of Ceylon. The early Buddhism of South-east Asia should not, however, be seen as a simple import. By the time of the inscriptions it had already adapted to local social and cultural conditions, and evolved its own characteristics.

II. PĀLI INSCRIPTIONS ON A STONE DHAMMACAKKA AND AN OCTAGONAL PILLAR FROM CHAI NAT¹

Among the interesting inscriptions unearthed in Siam in recent years are some fragments in Pāli, inscribed in the South-east Asian Pallava script on a stone *dhammacakka* or “wheel of the law” and on an octagonal stone pillar, which originally supported the wheel. The fragments were discovered at Tambon Hang Nam Sakhon, Amphoe Manorom, Chai Nat (Jayanāda) Province, on 5th October, 2531 [1988]. The inscription has been published in a Fine Arts Department report entitled *The Archaeology of U Taphao*.¹ Its paleography has been discussed by Christian Bauer in his “Notes on Mon Epigraphy” (accompanied by four plates, without transcription).² The Fine Arts Department dates the inscription to the 12th century BE (*circa* 550–650

* References to Pāli texts are to roman script editions of the Pali Text Society (PTS); to Thai-script editions of the Syāmratthassa Tepitakam (SyR) or those published by the Mahāmakuṭarājavidyālaya (Mm); to Burmese script Chatthasaṅgīti editions (ChS); or to Nāgarī script Nālandā editions (Nāl), as available.

¹ *Boranakhadi Muang U Taphao*, Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2534 [1991]. A transcription and Thai translation of the fragments by Cha-ame Kaewglai is given in an Appendix, pp. 179–82, an English summary of the book at pp. 183–93. For two photographs of the *dharmaṭakra* and one of the pillar, see (the unnumbered) pp. 32, 33. Cf. also *The Silpakorn Journal*, Vol. 34, No. 2 (1991), pp. 4–50.

² “Notes on Mon Epigraphy”, *Journal of the Siam Society* 79/1 (1991), Pls. 1–4 and pp. 48–55.

CE), while Bauer concludes that it is possible “to date this *dhammacakra* with certainty to the 6th century AD”.³

The surviving fragments of the wheel, which is carved in the round, are inscribed on both rim and spokes. Associated finds include fragments of an ear and the nose and mouth of a stone deer.⁴ Pairs of recumbent deer, symbolizing the Deer Park where the Buddha delivered the First Sermon, have been found in association with *dhammacakkas* elsewhere in Central Siam. The motif of a wheel flanked by a pair of deer is known from sculpture and monastic sealings from Northern India, and frequently adorns the roof-tops of Tibetan temples up to the present day.

I give here a romanized version of Cha-ame Kaewglai’s Thai script transcription.⁵ The sequence is that of Cha-ame’s restored text; the numbers in square brackets are those assigned to fragments or groups of fragments by the Fine Arts Department. In No. 1.a, text in square brackets is supplied from the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*; in Nos. 1.b and 2, the symbol “×××” indicates missing text.

1. *Dhammacakka* inscriptions

1.a. Rim of the wheel: *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*

[6] [pu]bbe ananussutesu dhammesu cakkhum udapādi

[5] dukkham ariyyasaccam pariññeyyan ti me bhikkhave [pubbe ananussutesu dhammesu] cakkhum [udapādi ñāñam udapādi] paññā udapādi vijjā udapādi

³ Bauer, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

⁴ Illustrated in *Boranakhadi Muang U Taphao*, p. 22.

⁵ Unfortunately a complete set of photographs of the inscriptions has not been published, and only a few of those mentioned above are readable.

[1] [ā]loko udapādi // [taṁ kho panidam dukkhaṁ ariyasaccam] pariññātan ti me bhikkhave pubbe ananussutesu dhammesu cakkhum udapādi ñāṇam udapādi paṁñā udapādi vijjā udapādi āloko udapādi // idam dukkhasamudayo ariyya[saccan ti me bhikkhave...]

[3] paṁñā udapādi vijjā udapādi āloko udapādi // taṁ kho panidam dukkhanirodho ariyya[saccam...]

[2] [sa]cchikātabban ti me bhikkhave pubbe ananussutesu dhammesu cakkhum udapādi⁶ ñāṇam udapādi paṁñā udapādi vijjā udapādi āloko udapādi⁷ // [taṁ kho panidam dukkhanirodho ariyasaccam] sacchikatan ti me bhikkhave pu-

[4] -bbe ananussutesu dhammesu cakkhum udapādi ñāṇam udapādi paṁñā udapādi vijjā udapādi [āloko udapādi]

1.b. Spokes: Commentary on the Four Truths?

[8]⁸

- (1) na
- (2) tti
- (3) pilana
- (4) samudayasa⁹
- (5) dhipateyya¹⁰
- (6) sa ××× /
- (7) ×××
- (8) ×××

⁶ *dudapādi*, Cha-ame.

⁷ *dudapādi*, Cha-ame.

⁸ The numbers in parentheses are those assigned to individual spokes.

⁹ See the upper spoke in Bauer, Pl. 3.

¹⁰ See the lower spoke in Bauer, Pl. 3.

[9]

- (1) dhi
- (2) samudayasa

2. Inscription on octagonal pillar: Verses¹¹

[7] (1) ×××

(2) ××× tato ××× dimata¹² // tobā¹³ ×××

(3) ××× mena iti saccam visattikā tam ×××

(4) ××× mena tato saccam idam matam / / ×××

(5) ××× iti so¹⁴ saccasam¹⁵ ×××

Discussion

1.a) Fragments 1 to 6 belong to the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*, the first sermon spoken by the Buddha to the Group of Five Monks at the Deer Park (Migadāya) at Isipatana in Vārāṇasī.¹⁶ The surviving portions all belong to the section on the Buddha's realization of the three insights (*sacca-*, *kicca-*, *kata-ñāṇam*) into the first three Truths of the Noble Ones (*ariya-sacca*).¹⁷ Since the fourth Truth must have been included, we may

¹¹ Most of the pillar text can be read from the plate at *Boranakhadi Muang U Taphao*, p. 33, and Bauer, Pl. 4. The numbers in parentheses are those of the lines, after Bauer.

¹² From Bauer's plate it appears that Cha-ame's reading may be corrected to (*i*)*da(m)* *matam*, as in the texts (the "texts" will be described and cited below).

¹³ *tobā* cannot be right: the texts have here *tam vina*.

¹⁴ Cha-ame reads *sā*, but the reading is clearly *so*, as in the texts.

¹⁵ The last word might be *samato*: only a single *ma* is visible, followed by what might be the left-hand curve of an *o*.

¹⁶ *Samyuttanikāya*, *Mahāvagga*, *Saccasamyutta*, *Dhammacakkappavattana-vagga*, 1.

¹⁷ SN (PTS) V 422.2–22; (SyR) Vol. 19, 529.11–530.10. The same text occurs

conclude that the rim of the wheel gave at least the complete text of the realization of the three insights into each of the Four Truths.

As transcribed, the text presents two orthographical peculiarities:

ariyya in Frags. [5], [1], and [3];

paññā in Frags. [1], [3], [2], and [4] (but *paññā* in Frag. [5]).

We may also note that the text has *dukkhasamudayo* in Frag. [1] and *dukkhanirodho* in Frag. [3], which agree with the readings of SyR (both SN and *Vinaya*), against the *dukkhasamudayam* and *dukkhanirodham* of PTS (both SN and *Vinaya*).¹⁸

1.b) The fragmentary condition of the inscriptions prevents a precise identification. The presence (twice) of the word *samudayasa* on a *dhammacakka* inscribed with the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta* leaves little doubt that the subject is again the Four Truths. The two other preserved words, *pilana* and *[ā]dhipateyya*, do not occur in connection with the Four Truths in the early *sutta* literature. The citation might therefore belong to the later commentarial literature, which assigns four meanings to each of the Four Truths, and includes the two terms:¹⁹

in the *Mahāvagga* of the *Vinaya*: (PTS) I 11.1–14; (SyR) Vol. 4, 19.10–20.16. Almost the same text occurs as an independent *sutta*, *Tathāgatena vuttam*, at SN V (PTS) 424–25, (SyR) 532–34, with the substitution of *tathāgatānam* for *me*.

¹⁸ The question of case endings of the Four Truths has been discussed in detail by K.R. Norman, "The Four Noble Truths: A Problem of Pāli Syntax", in L.A. Hercus *et al.* (ed.), *Indological and Buddhist Studies, Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*, 2nd. ed., Delhi, 1984, pp. 377–91 (see especially § 1.5) (= *Collected Papers* Vol. II, PTS, Oxford 1991).

¹⁹ Here and in the following citations I underline the terms that occur in the Chai Nat inscription.

- A. *dukkha*: (1) *pilana*, (2) *saṃkhata*, (3) *santāpa*, (4) *vipariṇāma*;
- B. *samudaya*: (5) *āyuhana*, (6) *nidāna*, (7) *saññoga*, (8) *palibodha*;
- C. *nirodha*: (9) *nissarana*, (10) *viveka*, (11) *asamkhata*, (12) *amata*;
- D. *magga*: (13) *niyyāna*, (14) *hetu*, (15) *dassana*, (16) *ādhipateyya*.

A concise statement of this theory is found near the end of the *Buddhānussatikathā* of the *Visuddhimagga*:²⁰

pilana-saṃkhata-santāpa-vipariṇāmaṭṭhena vā dukham ariya-saccam; āyūhana-nidāna-saṃyoga-palibodhaṭṭhena samudayam; nissarana-vivekāsaṃkhata-amataṭṭhena nirodham; niyyānika-hetu-dassanādhipateyyaṭṭhena maggam.

The Truth of the Noble Ones regarding suffering has the senses of (1) oppressing, (2) being compounded, (3) burning, and (4) change. Origin has the senses of (5) accumulating, (6) source, (7) bond, and (8) obstructing. Cessation has the senses of (9) final release, (10) solitude, (11) being uncompounded, and (12) being free from death. The path has the senses of (13) outlet, (14) cause, (15) seeing, and (16) predominance.

The four senses of the Truth of the Path (*maggasacca*) are preserved in another inscription, on a *dhammacakka* from Nakhon Pathom dated to the 6th or 7th century: *niyyānikahetudassanādhipateyyabhbhāvena maggasacce*.²¹ The phrasing is close but not identical to that of the *Visuddhimagga*.

²⁰ Chap. VII.62; (Mm) I 271.2–5.

²¹ Bauer, *op. cit.*, Fig. F, no. Kd.24 (for which read Kd.29; for Coedès 1956 read Coedès 1966) gives 6th century; *Charuk nai prathet thai* (hereafter referred to as *Charuk*), Vol. I, National Library-Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2529 [1986], p. 59 gives 12th century BE = *circa* 550–650 CE. See also Supaphan na

The 16 meanings (*attha*) are different from the 16 aspects (*ākāra*) of the Four Truths, well-known in the Vaibhāṣika tradition, and are apparently unique to Theravādin exegesis.²² The earliest evidence of the Theravādin theory is in the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, where the terms occur several times.²³ The first occurrence is early in the text, in the "Discussion of Insight" of the *Mahāvagga*:²⁴

Bangchang, *Wiwathanakan ngan khian phasa bali nai prathet thai: charuk tamnan phongsawadan san prakat*, Bangkok, 2529 [1986], pp. 34–36; G. Coedès, "Une roue de la loi avec inscription en pāli provenant du site de P'ra Pathom", *Artibus Asiae* 19 (1966), pp. 222, 225.

²² For the 16 aspects according to the Vaibhāṣikas see e.g. Valentina Stache-Rosen (ed., tr.), *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im Älteren Buddhismus II, Das Saṅgītisūtra und sein Kommentar Saṅgītiparyāya*, Part I, Berlin, 1968, IV.14 (p. 100); I. Armelin (tr.), *Le coeur de la loi suprême, Traité de Fa-cheng, Abhidharmaḥṛdayaśāstra de Dharmāśrī*, Paris, 1978, p. 116; José Van den Broeck (tr.), *La saveur de l'immortel (A-p'i-t'an Kan Lu Wei Lun), la version chinoise de l'Amṛtarasa de Ghosaka (T. 1553)*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1977, p. 170; Marcel Van Velthem (ed., tr.) *Le traité de la descente dans la profonde loi (Abhidharmāvatāraśāstra) de l'Arhat Skandhila*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1977, pp. 48 (translation), 98.5–16 (text); *Sārasamuccaya-nāma-abhidharmāvatāra-ṭīkā*, Peking Tanjur No. 5598, Vol. 119, *mñon pa thu*, 359b8 foll.; N. Aiyaswami Sastri, *Pañcavastuka Śāstra and Pañcavastuka-vibhāṣā*, Santiniketan, n.d., p. 10; *Abhidharmakośa* VII, 13a; Louis de La Vallée Poussin, *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, tome V, Brussels, 1971, pp. 30–39; Padmanabh S. Jaini (ed.), *Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti*, Patna, 1977, pp. 329–30; Chr. Lindtner (ed.), "Candrakīrti's Pañcaskandhaprakarana, I. Tibetan Text", *Acta Orientalia* XL (1979), pp. 140–41.

²³ Although the *Paṭisambhidāmagga* is included in the *Khuddaka-nikāya* of the Pāli Canon, it is stylistically related to the Abhidhamma and Commentarial literature: see A.K. Warder, *Indian Buddhism*, Delhi, 1970, pp. 312–16; A.K. Warder, Introduction to Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli (tr.), *The Path of Discrimination*, London, 1982; K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature* (Jan Gonda [ed.], *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. VII, Fasc. 2), Wiesbaden, 1983, pp. 87–89. Tradition ascribes the work to Sāriputta. Warder's assertion (Introduction to Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli, p. xlvi, repeated almost *verbatim* in Norman, *Pāli Literature*, p. 132) that "Mahānāma begins [his commentary, the *Saddhammapakāśini*] by saying that Sāriputta explained the *Dhammacakkappavattana Suttanta* by

Continues...

A. *dukkhaṭṭho abhiññeyyo dukkhassa pilanatṭho abhiññeyyo dukkhassa saṃkhataṭṭho abhiññeyyo²⁵ dukkhassa santapaṭṭho abhiññeyyo dukkhassa vipariṇāmaṭṭho abhiññeyyo.*

B. *samudayaṭṭho abhiññeyyo samudayassa āyuhanaṭṭho abhiññeyyo samudayassa nidānaṭṭho abhiññeyyo samudayassa saññogaṭṭho abhiññeyyo samudayassa palibodhaṭṭho abhiññeyyo.*

C. *nirodhaṭṭho²⁶ abhiññeyyo nirodhassa nissaraṇaṭṭho abhiññeyyo nirodhassa vivekaṭṭho abhiññeyyo nirodhassa asaṃkhataṭṭho abhiññeyyo nirodhassa amataṭṭho abhiññeyyo.*

D. *maggatṭho abhiññeyyo maggassa niyyānatṭho abhiññeyyo maggassa hetuṭṭho abhiññeyyo maggassa dassanaṭṭho abhiññeyyo maggassa ādhipateyyatṭho abhiññeyyo.*

A longer passage occurs in the “Discussion of the Truths” in the “Chapter on Pairs”.²⁷

composing the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*” is incorrect. The text reads (Mm I 2.4):

*saddhammacakkānupavattakena saddhammasenāpatisāvakena
suttēsu vuttēsu tathāgatēna bhūtatthavedittam upāgatena
yo bhāsito bhāsitakovidēna dhammappadīpujjalanāyakena
pāṭho visiṭṭho paṭisambhidānaṃ maggo ti...*

The verses refer to the author, Sāriputta, by several of his epithets—the one who turns the *dhammacakka* after the Buddha (*saddhammacakkānupavattake*: cf. *Suttanipāta* 556–57 = *Theragāthā* 826–27), the Dhamma-general (*saddhammasenāpati*: cf. *Theragāthā* 1083)—but say nothing about the *Dhammacakkapavattana-sutta*.

²⁴ *Ñānakathā*, (PTS) I 19.31–20.6; (SyR) 28.10–20; translation pp. 21–22. For a commentary see *Saddhammapakāsinī nāma paṭisambhidāmaggaṭṭhakathā*, (Mm, BE 2465 [= CE 1922]) I 123.14–124.4.

²⁵ SyR : PTS omits *dukkhassa saṃkhataṭṭho abhiññeyyo*.

²⁶ *nirodhaṭṭho* SyR : *nirodho* PTS.

A. *katham dukkham tathaṭṭhena saccam?* cattāro dukkhassa dukkhaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā: dukkhassa *pīlanattho* sañkhataṭṭho santāpaṭṭho vipariñāmaṭṭho. *ime cattāro dukkhassa dukkhaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā;* evam dukkham tathaṭṭhena saccam.

B. *katham samudayo tathaṭṭhena saccam?* cattāro *samudayassa* samudayaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā: *samudayassa* āyuhanaṭṭho *nidānattho* saññogaṭṭho *palibodhaṭṭho*. *ime cattāro samudayassa* samudayaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā; evam samudayo tathaṭṭhena saccam.

C. *katham nirodho tathaṭṭhena saccam?* cattāro nirodhassa nirodhaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā: nirodhassa nissaraṇaṭṭho vivekaṭṭho asaṅkhataṭṭho amataṭṭho. *ime cattāro nirodhassa* nirodhaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā; evam nirodho tathaṭṭhena saccam.

D. *katham maggo tathaṭṭhena saccam?* cattāro maggassa maggaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā: maggassa niyyānaṭṭho hetuṭṭho dassanaṭṭho *ādhipateyyaṭṭho*. *ime cattāro maggassa maggaṭṭhā* tathā avitathā anaññathā; evam maggo tathaṭṭhena saccam.

The next evidence for the theory is from the *Vimuttimagga*, a manual transmitted by the Abhayagiri school in Ceylon and abroad. The work was composed by Upatissa, in perhaps the 1st century CE, and

²⁷ *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, *Yuganaddhavagga*, *Saccakathā*, (PTS) II 104.14–105.10; (SyR) Vol. 31, 449.5–20; translation p. 297. The passage is cited in abbreviation under *vibhāga* in the *Saccaniddesa* of the *Visuddhimagga* (Chap. XVI.15, Mm III 76.18–77.4) and in the *Saccavibhaṅga* of the *Sammohavinodanī nāma vibhaṅga-attīhakathā*, (ChS 78.14–19; Nāl 84.12–17).

certainly before the time of Buddhaghosa (first half of the 5th century).²⁸ The original Pāli is lost, but the complete text survives in Chinese translation, done by *Saṃghabhara, a *bhikkhu* of Funan (an early state in the region of southern mainland South-east Asia), at the beginning of the 6th century.²⁹ The section in question is also preserved in Tibetan translation, as cited by the North Indian scholar Daśabalaśrīmitra in his *Samskṛtāsaṃskṛta-viniścaya*, composed in the 12th or 13th century.³⁰ It deals with the Four Truths under the heading “natures” or “characteristics” (*mtshan ñid* = *lakkhana*).

(Tibetan text)³¹

mtshan ñid žes pa ni (a) *sdug bsñal ni ñes pa'i mtshan ñid dañ/*
 (b) *kun 'byuñ ni rgyu'i mtshan ñid dañ/* (c) *'gog pa ni mi skye*
ba'i mtshan ñid dañ/ (d) *lam ni*³² *thabs kyi mtshan ñid do//*
*yañ na*³³ *sdug bsñal ni* (1) *gzir ba'i mtshan ñid dañ/* (2) *kun*
*du*³⁴ *gduñ ba'i mtshan ñid dañ/* (3) *'dus byas kyi mtshan ñid*
dañ/ (4) *yoñs su 'gyur ba'i mtshan ñid do//* *kun 'byuñ ni* (5)
'phen par byed pa'i mtshan ñid dañ/ (6) *gži'i*³⁵ *mtshan ñid dañ/*

²⁸ Norman, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

²⁹ For the affiliation of the *Vimuttimagga* and the name and date of the translator, see P. Skilling, “*Vimuttimagga* and Abhayagiri: The Form-aggregate according to the *Samskṛtāsaṃskṛta-viniścaya*”, *JPTS* XX (1994) 171–210.

³⁰ For Daśabalaśrīmitra see P. Skilling, “The Samskṛtāsaṃskṛta-viniścaya of Daśabalaśrīmitra”, *Buddhist Studies Review*, 4/1 (1987), pp. 3–23, and “Theravādin Literature in Tibetan Translation”, *JPTS* XIX (1993), pp. 140–42.

³¹ Daśabalaśrīmitra (sTobs bcu dpal bṣes gñen), *'Dus byas dañ 'dus ma byas rnam par ñes pa*, Derge Tanjur (D) No. 3897, *dbu ma ha*, 192b4–7; Peking Tanjur (Q) No. 5865, Vol. 146, *ño mtshar ño*, 109a6–b2.

³² *ni* D : Q omits.

³³ /D : Q omits.

³⁴ *kun du* D : *kun tu* Q.

³⁵ *gži'i* Q : *bži'i* D.

(7) *kun du tshogs*³⁶ *pa'i mtshan ñid dañ/* (8) *yoñs su sbags pa'i mtshan ñid do// 'gog pa ni* (9) *ñes par 'byuñ ba'i mtshan ñid dañ*³⁷ (10) *dben pa'i mtshan ñid dañ/* (11) *'dus ma byas kyi mtshan ñid dañ/* (12) *mi 'chi ba'i mtshan ñid do// lam ni* (13) *ñes par 'byin par byed pa'i mtshan ñid dañ/* (14) *yañ dag par thob par byed pa'i mtshan ñid dañ/* (15) *mthoñ ba'i mtshan ñid dañ/* (16) *lhag pa'i bdag po'i mtshan ñid do//*

(Translation from the Tibetan)³⁸

“Natures” (*lakkhana*): (a) suffering (*dukkha*) has the nature of fault (*dosa*). (b) Origin (*samudaya*) has the nature of cause (*hetu*). (c) Cessation (*nirodha*) has the nature of non-birth (*anuppatti?*). (d) Path (*maggā*) has the nature of method (*upāya*).³⁹

Furthermore, suffering has (1) the nature of oppressing (*pīlana*),⁴⁰ (2) the nature of burning (*santāpa*), (3) the nature of being compounded (*samkhata*), and (4) the nature of change (*vipariñāma*). Origin has (5) the nature of projecting,⁴¹ (6) the

³⁶ *kun du tshogs* D : *kun tu 'tshogs* Q.

³⁷ *dañ/* D : *do//* Q.

³⁸ The Pāli terms given in parentheses are equivalents of standard Sanskrit equivalents of the Tibetan; references are to Lokesh Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*, Compact edition, Kyoto, 1990 (TSD). Nos. 1–4, 6, 9–13, and 15–16 agree with the Pāli. The order of nos. 2 and 3 is opposite to that of the Pāli. The remaining items are discussed in the notes.

³⁹ I have not traced an exact Pāli parallel to (a)–(d), which agrees with the Chinese.

⁴⁰ *gzir ba* = *PīD*: *pīdita*, *paripīdita*, *prapīdita*, also *ardita*, *ātura*, *ārta*: TSD pp. 2083–84.

⁴¹ *'phen pa* is regularly used for the root *KṣIP*; *byed pa* = *karāṇa*. Cf. TSD pp. 1592–93: *'phen pa* = *ākṣepa*, *ākṣepaṇa*, *āvedha*, *preraka*. The term may be interpreted to mean that *tañhā* projects further existence and rebirth. I cannot

nature of source (*nidāna*), (7) the nature of accumulating,⁴² and (8) the nature of defiling.⁴³ Cessation has (9) the nature of final release (*nissarana*), (10) the nature of solitude (*viveka*), (11) the nature of being uncompounded (*asamkhata*), and (12) the nature of freedom from death (*amata*). The path has (13) the nature of outlet (*niyyāna*), (14) the nature of achieving,⁴⁴ (15) the nature of seeing (*dassana*), and (16) the nature of predominance (*ādhipateyya*).⁴⁵

suggest a Pāli equivalent.

⁴² The Pāli has here *sam-yoga*. The Tibetan *kun tu* = *sam*; it is possible that here *tshogs* (= accumulation, collection, group) = *yoga*, although such a translation is not attested. *kun tu tshogs pa* = *samāgatā* (TSD p. 24). Cf. Akira Hirakawa *et al.*, *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Part 1, Tokyo, 1973, p. 362, *samyoga* = *mtshuṇs par ldan pa, phrad pa, 'brel ba, reg pa*. The term may be interpreted to mean that *tanhā* accumulates suffering; in fact, in the present context, this seems a more suitable interpretation of *samyoga* than the sense of “bond” = *saññōjana*, though both are possible.

⁴³ The Pāli has here *palibodha* = “obstruction, hindrance, obstacle, impediment, drawback” (PED), a term which does not seem to be known in Buddhist Sanskrit. The Tibetan *yoṇs su* = *pari. sbags*, a rather rare term in translation literature, does not carry the sense “obstruct”, but rather to saturate, dampen, besmear, stain, pollute: cf. TSD p. 1742, *khrag gis sbags* = *rudhira-mrakṣita*; *khrag sbags śiṇ* = *rudhiralipita*; Lokesh Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary, Supplementary Volume 5* (New Delhi, 1993, p. 1349) *sbags (pa)* = *akta, ādigdha, ārdra, sikta*; Hirakawa *et al.*, p. 300, *mrakṣa* = *sbags*. Derge appears to read *spags*, but I believe that *sbags* is the correct reading. I cannot suggest a possible Pāli equivalent.

⁴⁴ Here the Tibetan is certainly different from the Pāli, which has *hetu* (a term regularly rendered in Tibetan as *rgyu*). The Tibetan *yaṇ dag par* = *sam*; *thob pa* = *PRĀP*; *byed pa* = *karana*. Equivalents listed in TSD (p. 2128) include *samprāpana* and *samudāgama*. The Tibetan seems to be confirmed by the Chinese, rendered as “arriving”. The term may be interpreted to mean that *magga* leads to the realization of the levels of the *ariyas*: *sotāpanna* up to *arahat*.

⁴⁵ *lhag pa* = *adhi*; *bdag po* = *adhipati* (TSD p. 1198). Sanskrit *ādhipatya* is usually rendered as *dbāṇ byed (pa)*, *dbāṇ (po)*, but there is little doubt that here the text read *ādhipateyya*.

(Translation from the Chinese)⁴⁶

How, through characteristics? (a) Ill is the characteristic of suffering. (b) Origin is the characteristic of cause. (c) Cessation is the characteristic of non-birth. (d) The path is the characteristic of the means of success.⁴⁷

And again, ill is the characteristic of (1) grief, (2) despair, (3) the put together, (4) the limited.⁴⁸ Origin is the characteristic of (5) accumulation, (6) cause, condition,⁴⁹ (7) fetters, (8) clinging. Cessation is the characteristic of (9) renunciation, (10) solitude, (11) the non-conditioned and (12) the choice. The path is the characteristic of (13) vehicle, (14) arriving, (15) seeing, (16) reliance. Thus should these be known through characteristics.

On the whole the *Vimuttimagga* version of the 16 natures or characteristics agrees with that of the *Patisambhidāmagga*, and confirms that the exegesis was early and “pan-Theravādin”. The next evidence of the theory is found in the *Visuddhimagga* (see above), a manual of the 5th-century Mahāvihāravāsins. It is also given in still later texts such as the *Sāratthasamuccaya*, a commentary on the *Catubhāṇavāra* composed probably in Ceylon in the second half of the 12th century, and in the *Paṭhamasambodhi*, a South-east Asian life of the Buddha (date uncertain).⁵⁰

⁴⁶ Translation from N.R.M. Ehara, Soma Thera, and Kheminda Thera, *The Path of Freedom (Vimuttimagga)*, [Colombo, 1961] Kandy, 1977, pp. 274, ult-275.7. The translation shows a number of infelicities, and Nos. 4, 12, and 16 are obscure (the numbering is my own).

⁴⁷ “means of success” might equal the *thabs* = *upāya* of the Tibetan.

⁴⁸ Could the Chinese translate *viparimāṇa* in place of *vipariṇāma*?

⁴⁹ I take “cause, condition” to represent one characteristic.

⁵⁰ *Sāratthasamuccaya*, *Atthakathā-bhāṇavāra*, Vol. 4, repr. Bangkok, BE 2532

While the text inscribed on the spokes may be related in part to the 16 senses of the Four Truths, it is impossible to match all of the fragments. [8](3) and (5), *pilana* and *ādhipateyya*, certainly belong to the group. The *na* of [8](1) might belong to *āyuhana*, *nidāna*, or *niyāna*. The *samudayasa* of [8](4) and [9](2) might be *samudayassa*, or possibly *samudaya-sacca*. The *sa* of [8](6) might be *samudaya*, *sacca*, or *saññoga*. But there are no counterparts to the *tti* of [8](2) or the *dhi* of [9](1) (unless for some reason *ādhipateyya* was given twice).⁵¹

2) The complete text of the octagonal pillar fragments may be restored from a set of five verses cited without attribution in two of Buddhaghosa's works, the *Visuddhimagga* and *Sammohavinodanī*, in the *Saddhammapakāsinī* of Mahānāma, which probably dates to the early 6th century, and in a *Vinaya-ṭikā*, the *Sāratthadīpanī*, composed in Ceylon during the reign of Parakkamabāhu (12th century).⁵² The citation gives one verse for each of the Four Truths in succession, followed by a concluding verse:

[CE 1989], Chap. 21, commentary on the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*, p. 53.9 foll.; *Pathamasambodhi* (*Phasabali*), Bangkok, 2537 [1993], *Dhammacakka-parivatta*, p. 126.8 foll. These references were first noted in G. Coedès, "Une roue de la loi...", p. 226.

⁵¹ For *tti*, we may also consider as candidates *pavatti* (for *dukkha*) or *nivatti* (for *nirodha*): see *Visuddhimagga*, Chap. XVI.23, *pavatti-pavattana-nivatti-nivattana-lakkhaṇāni*. Another possibility is the **anuppatti* of the *Vimuttimagga*.

⁵² *Visuddhimagga* Chap. XVI.25, (Mm) III 79.13–80.3; *Sammohavinodanī nāma vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā*, (ChS) 80.12–22, (Nāl) 86.18–87.2; *Saddhammapakāsinī nāma patisambhidāmaggaṭṭhakathā*, (Mm, BE 2465 [= CE 1922]) I 74.1–11 (for Mahānāma see Warder, "Introduction", p. xliv and Norman, *Pāli Literature*, pp. 132–33); *Sāratthadīpanī nāma vinayaṭikā* (Mm) IV 75,ult–76.10. Phrases preserved in the inscription are underlined. For a commentary on the verses see *Paramatthamaṇjuśāya nāma visuddhi-maggasamvaṇṇanāya mahāṭikāsammatāya tatiyo bhāgo*, (Mm) 176.6–177.6.

apica

<i>nābādhakam yato dukkham</i>	<i>dukkhā aññam na bādhakam</i>
<i>bādhakattaniyāmena</i>	<i><u>tato saccam idam matam.</u></i>
<i>tañ vinā nāññato dukkham</i>	<i>na hoti na ca tam tato⁵³</i>
<i>dukkhahetuniyāmena</i>	<i><u>iti saccam visattikā.</u>⁵⁴</i>
<i>nāññā nibbānato santi</i>	<i>santam na ca na tam yato</i>
<i>santabhāvaniyāmena</i>	<i><u>tato saccam idam matam.</u></i>
<i>maggā aññam na niyyānam</i>	<i>aniyyāno na cāpi so</i>
<i>tacchaniyānabhāvattā⁵⁵</i>	<i><u>iti so saccasammato.</u></i>
<i>iti tacchāvipallāsa-</i>	<i>bhūtabhāvam catūsvapi⁵⁶</i>
<i>dukkhādīsu visesena⁵⁷</i>	<i>saccaṭṭham⁵⁸ āhu pañditāti.</i>

There is no pain but is affliction,
 And naught that is not pain afflicts:
 This certainty that it afflicts
 Is what is reckoned here as truth.

No other source of pain than craving,
 Nor aught that source provides but pain:

⁵³ *Visuddhimagga* (Mm) only has *tan tato*.

⁵⁴ The word *visattikā* occurs (usually in connection with *tañhā* and as object of forms of the verb *TRĪ*) at *Dhammapada* 180a, 335b; *Suttanipāta* 333c, 768c, 857d; the Sanskrit *viśaktikā* occurs at *Udānavarga* 3:14c, 15a; 15:4f; 16:6c, 8c, 10c; 29:53a, 55a; 30:17d. It is not clear to me how Nāṇamoli arrived at his rendering of the term as “considered” (see below).

⁵⁵ *Saddhammapakāsini* only has here *-bhāvena*.

⁵⁶ *catūsvapi* *Visuddhimagga* (HOS, Mm), *Saddhammapakāsini* (Mm), *Sāratthadīpanī* (Mm); *catusu pi Sammohavinodanī* (ChS), *catusvapi Sammohavinodanī* (Nāl).

⁵⁷ So *Visuddhimagga* Mm, *Sāratthadīpanī* Mm: v.l. *dukkhādīsvāvisesena* (*Saddhammapakāsini* Mm), *dukkhādīsvavisesena* (*Visuddhimagga* HOS; *Sammohavinodanī* ChS [-ādī-], Nāl).

⁵⁸ *Saddhammapakāsini* (Mm) only reads *saccaṭṭham*.

This certainty in causing pain
Is why it is considered truth.

There is no peace except nibbāna,
Nibbāna cannot be but peace:
This certainty that it is peace
Is what is reckoned here as truth.

No outlet other than the path,
Nor fails the path to be the outlet:
Its status as the very outlet
Has made it recognised as truth.

This real infallibility,
Which is their true essential core,
Is what the wise declare to be
Truth's meaning common to all four.⁵⁹

Enough of the text is preserved to show that the pillar gave at least the first four verses. The *Visuddhimagga* of Buddhaghosa (first half of the 5th century), the *Sammohavinodanī* and Mahānāma's *Saddhammapakāsini* (early 6th century) are earlier than the inscription, but since the verse is a citation, it is not certain that any of these is the source of the inscription, which remains unknown.

Texts dealing with the Four Truths are found on other *dhammacakka* inscriptions from the same period (BE 12th–14th

⁵⁹ Translation from Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli, *The Path of Purification*, Third edition, Kandy, 1975, p. 565 and *The Dispeller of Delusion*, Part I, London, 1987, p. 104.

centuries).⁶⁰ A wheel from Wat Phra Śrī Ratanamahādhātu, Amphoe Muang, Lop Buri was inscribed with the *Dhammacakkappavattanasutta*, as shown by the fragment *udapādi vijjā uda[pādi]*, part of the “refrain” that describes the arising of insight into the Four Truths.⁶¹ The following non-canonical verse was popular:

*sacca kicca kata ñāṇam catudhā catudhā katam
tivatṭam dvādasākāram dhammacakkam mahesino.*

Insight into truth, task, and accomplishment
each performed four times
make up the three turnings and twelve aspects
that are the wheel of the dhamma of the Great Sage [the
Buddha].

The complete verse is preserved on the base of a *dhammacakka* from Amphoe Kamphaeng Saen, Nakhon Pathom Province⁶² and on the hub of a wheel from the same province. Individual spokes of the latter name the “twelve aspects” of the Four Truths.⁶³ Fragments of the verse are known from octagonal pillar fragments from Sap Champa, Amphoe Chai Badan, Lop Buri; the verse follows the *ye dhammā gāthā* and is followed by several canonical verses.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ For a list of *dhammacakkas* see Bauer, Fig. F (p. 50); for a bibliography see Bauer, n. 44 (p. 70). Unless otherwise noted, Bauer dates the inscriptions to the 6th century CE.

⁶¹ Supaphan p. 39; *Charuk I* 123–25; *Charuk boran run raek phop ti lop buri lae klai khiang* (hereafter referred to as *Lop Buri*), Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2524 [1981], pp. 5–6.

⁶² Supaphan p. 37; *Charuk I* 98–99.

⁶³ Supaphan pp. 34–36; *Charuk I* 59–64; Coedès, “Une roue de la loi...”, pp. 221–26.

⁶⁴ Supaphan pp. 21–27; *Lop Buri* 28–29, 74–81. Bauer (Fig. F) dates the inscription to the 7th century CE.

The verse summarizes the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*. The “three turnings” (*tivattha*) are the “insights (*ñāna*) into truth (*sacca*), task (*kicca*), and accomplishment (*kata*)” applied to each of the Four Truths (*catudhā catudhā katam*); these constitute the “twelve aspects” (*dvādasākāra*) of insight into the Truths, which are the “wheel of the dhamma” taught by the Great Sage at the Deer Park.⁶⁵ As Coedès has pointed out, the verse is found in the *Dhammacakkappavattana* chapter of the *Pathamasambodhi*⁶⁶ and in the *Sāratthasamuccaya*.⁶⁷ As noted by Coedès, the two works are centuries later than the inscriptions, which date to the 6th or 7th centuries: neither can be the source of the verse, which remains unknown.

The four truths are listed in a canonical verse known from an inscribed brick from U Thong (Suphan Buri) and a stone bar from Nakhon Pathom, as well as (in a slightly Sanskritized Pāli) from Andhra Pradesh.⁶⁸ A number of votive tablets recently excavated at the important site of Yarang in Southern Thailand, dating to about the 7th century, list

⁶⁵ The twelve aspects are imbedded in an unidentified text of homage to the Buddha found on a stone Buddhapāda kept at Wat Chomphuwek, Amphoe Muang, Nonthaburi. The inscription, in the Khom or Khmer script and from a later period (*circa* BE 1800 = CE 1250), ends with the *ye dhammā* verse. See Supaphan pp. 29–33.

⁶⁶ George Coedès, “Une roue de la loi...”, p. 226, and “Une vie indochinoise du Buddha”, in *Mélanges d’Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou*, Paris, 1968, pp. 225–26. See now *Pathamasambodhi* (*Phasabali*), Bangkok, 2537 [1993], p. 127.6.

⁶⁷ Available to me (as also Coedès) only in the Thai translation, which cites the first three lines of the verse in Pāli: *Sāratthasamuccaya*, *Atthakathā-bhāṇavāra*, Vol. 4, repr. Bangkok, BE 2532 [CE 1989], Chap. 21, commentary on the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*, p. 239.12.

⁶⁸ See Part I of the present article.

the four truths, apparently in Sanskrit.⁶⁹ At least one wheel from Siam was inscribed with the text of the twelve links of conditioned arising (*paṭicca-samuppāda*), found on the spoke of a wheel from Amphoe Muang, Lop Buri.⁷⁰

The Chai Nat inscriptions add to our knowledge of the textual basis of Dvāravatī Buddhism. The evidence of the canonical extracts in Pāli (including those known from other inscriptions of the period), which agree closely with the Pāli canon as we know it, in conjunction with exegetical terms or phrases found in the *Paṭisambhidāmagga* and with verses found in the works of Buddhaghosa and in later texts, prove with certainty that a form of Theravādin Buddhism was current, perhaps predominant, in the Chao Phraya basin during the 6th and 7th centuries.

⁶⁹ Kongkaew Weeraprajak, "Analysis of the Inscriptions found at Yarang", *The Silpakorn Journal*, Vol. 33, No. 6, January–February 1990, pp. 35–50; Cha-ame Kaewglai, "Charuk ye dhammā", *The Silpakorn Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 5, September–October 1993, pp. 72–77.

⁷⁰ Supaphan p. 38; *Charuk I* 109–11; *Lop Buri* 7–10.

III. A PARITTA INSCRIPTION FROM ŚRIKṢETRA IN BURMA

In his *Historical Sites in Burma*, U Aung Thaw, then Director of Archaeology, referred to "a very recent discovery of a stone slab, unfortunately badly flaked and weathered...made near the Shwedaga Gate [at Śriks̄etra near Prome]. From the fragmentary lines could be read extracts from three popular Pāli recitations in verse, namely, the *Maṅgala Sutta*, the *Ratana Sutta*, and the *Mora Sutta*. It is datable to [the] 6th or 7th century."¹ The same author had already published the text of the inscriptions in an article written in Burmese in 1968.² As far as I know, a reproduction has not been published.

According to Aung Thaw's earlier article, the three texts are in fact from two different stones from two different sites.³ The *Mora-paritta* and *Maṅgala-sutta* are from the stone slab found near the Shwedaga gate. The slab carried about 28 lines of text; the centre is entirely effaced, and the seven fragmentary lines read by Aung Thaw are from the right side. The *Ratana-sutta* is from a stone from Kon Yoe village, north-west of Śriks̄etra. The broken stone carried four lines of

¹ Aung Thaw, *Historical Sites in Burma*, Ministry of Union Culture, [Rangoon], 1972, repr. 1978, p. 32.

² Aung Thaw, "New Light on Pyu Culture", *Union of Burma Journal of Literary and Social Sciences*, Research Development and Co-ordination Committee, Vol. 1, No. 1, Rangoon, January, 1968, pp. 49–59. The brief English summary on p. 261 does not mention the inscriptions. I am grateful to Michael Aung Thwin and May Kyi Win (Northern Illinois University) for copies of the article. The find has been discussed briefly by Sao Sāimōng Mangrāi in his *The Pādaeng Chronicle and the Jengtung State Chronicle Translated*, Ann Arbor, 1981, p. 15, referring (p. 295) to a paper in Burmese entitled "Later Evidence of Pyū Culture", read by U Aung Thaw at the Research Congress of Burma, Rangoon, 24 March 1966 (not seen).

³ I am grateful to the U.S. Library of Congress office in New Delhi for providing a summary of the relevant paragraphs, through the kind offices of E. Gene Smith.

text. Here I present a romanized version of Aung Thaw's Burmese character transcription, following the author's orthography and division of words and lines, without any changes.⁴

[I. *Mora-paritta*]

- 1.1....pathavippabhāso tamtañ na
- 1.2....apetayañ cakkhuma eka
- 1.3....vimuttiyā imamso

[II. *Mañgala-sutta*]

- 2.1....anāthapi
- 2.2....sādevatā bhagavantam gāthāya a
- 2.3....attasammāpa ni dhica etammañgala mutamam
- 2.4....jānikammāni etammañgalamu

[III. *Ratana-sutta*]

- 3.1. siddhamyañkiñ (khi) dhavāhuramvāsaggesuvā
yamratanañpanitam na...
- 3.2. attitathāgatena idampibuddheratanam
panitam etena saccena su...tu
- 3.3. yānidha bhūtāni...nibhummānivā
yānivā antalikkhe tathāgatam
- 3.4. devamanussapūjitañ...
...sañgham namassāmi

⁴ The author does not number the lines. His presentation of the seven lines of the Shwedaga gate slab is clear, but I am uncertain whether my resolution of his text of the Kon Yoe inscription into four lines is correct.

I. *Mora-paritta*

The first fragment is from the *Mora-jātaka*, the ninth text of the *Dalha-vagga* of the *Duka-nipāta* (*Jātaka* II 33–38). The verses of this *jātaka* were transmitted independently as the popular *Mora-paritta*.⁵ Line 1.1 of the inscription is from verse 1bc; line 1.2 is from verse 3a; line 1.3 is from verse 4de. The restored text is as follows:⁶

- 1a. [udet' ayam cakkhumā ekarājā]
- 1b. [harissavaṇṇo] (1.1) **pathavippabhāso**
- 1c. **taṁ taṁ na** [massāmi harissavaṇṇam pathavippabhāsam]
- 1.d. [tay' ajja guttā viharemu divasam]

- 3a. (1.2) **apet' ayam cakkhum** [ā] **eka** [rājā]
- 3b. [harissavaṇṇo pathavippabhāso]
- 3c. [taṁ taṁ namassāmi harissavaṇṇam pathavippabhāsam]
- 3.d. [tay' ajja guttā viharemu rattim]

- 4a. [ye brāhmaṇā vedagū sabbadhamme]
- 4b. [te me namo te ca maṁ pālayantu]
- 4c. [nam' atthu buddhānam nam' atthu bodhiyā]
- 4d. [namo vimuttānam namo] (1.3) **vimuttiyā**
- 4e. **imam** **so** [parittam katvā]
- 4f. [moro vāsam akappayi]

⁵ There are some differences in the numbering of the verses in different editions of the *paritta*, depending on whether or not the two introductory verses (not given in the *jātaka* version) are counted. I follow here the numbering in Lionel Lokuliyana, *Catubhānavārapāli, The Text of the Four Recitals, or The Great Book of Protections, Sinhala Maha Pirit Pota*, Colombo, n.d., pp. 34–37.

⁶ Restored portions are given in plain type within brackets. Preserved fragments are given in bold type.

II. *Maṅgala-sutta*

The second fragment is from the *Maṅgala-sutta*, the fourth sutta of the *Cūla-vagga* of the *Sutta-nipāta* (Sn pp. 46–47).⁷ Lines 2.1 and 2.2 are from the prose introduction (*nidāna*); line 2.3 gives the complete text of verse 3cd, and line 2.4 gives most of verse 6cd. The missing portions may be restored as follows:

Nidāna: [ekam̄ samayaṁ bhagavā sāvatthiyaṁ viharati jetavane] (2.1)
anāthapi[ñdikassa ārāme...ekam̄ antam̄ ṛhitā kho] (2.2) **sā devatā**
bhagavantam̄ gāthāya a[jjhabhāsi]...

3ab. [patirūpadesavāso ca pubbe ca katapuññatā]

3cd. (2.3) **attasammāpanidhi ca etam̄ maṅgalam̄ utamam̄(!)**

6ab. [dānañ ca dhammadariyā ca ñātakānañ ca saṅgaho]

6cd. [anavaj]-**(2.4)-jāni kammāni etam̄ maṅgalam̄ u**[uttamam̄]

III. *Ratana-sutta*

The third fragment is from the *Ratana-sutta*, the first sutta of the *Cūlavagga* of the *Sutta-nipāta* (Sn pp. 39–42). Lines 3.1–2 give most of verse 3; lines 3.3–4 give most of verse 15abc (or 16abc)⁸ and a fragment of line 17d, the last verse. The text may be restored as follows:

⁷ I refer here to the numbering of verses in the PTS edition of the *Suttanipāta*.

⁸ Since the first three lines of vv. 15 and 16 are the same, the lines might come from either verse. The first three lines of v. 17 are also the same, but I assume from the dotted line in Aung Thaw's text that there is a break with missing text, which rules out v. 17.

(3.1) *siddham*

3a. *yañkim*[ci vittam i]dha vā *huram* vā
 3b. *saggesu* vā *yam* *ratanam* *panitam*
 3c. *na* [no *samañ*] (3.2) *att[h]i*⁹ *tathāgatena*
 3d. *idam* pi *buddhe* *ratanam* *panitam*
 3e. *etenā saccena* *su*[vatthi ho]tu

15a. (3.3) *yānidha* *bhūtāni* [samāgatā]ni
 15b. *bhummāni* vā *yāni* vā *antalikkhe*
 15c. *tathāgatañ* (3.4) *devamanussapūjitañ*
 15d. [buddhañ namassāma suvatthi hotu]

 17a. [yānidha bhūtāni samāgatāni]
 17b. [bhummāni vā yāni vā antalikkhe]
 17c. [tathāgatañ devamanussapūjitañ]
 17d. (3.4) *sañgham* namassāmi(!) [suvatthi hotu]

The inscription seems to give an excerpt from the *Ratana-sutta*, rather than a complete text. The *siddham* at the beginning suggests that the text opened with verse 3 of the sutta. From verse 3 the extant text jumps to the end of the sutta. In the absence of any plates, or a more scientific description of the stone, it is impossible to say how much of the sutta was included in the inscription.

⁹The *atti* of the printed text might be a misprint for *atti*, the *ta* and the *tha* being similar in Burmese script.

Several other Pāli inscriptions are known from the area.¹⁰ Aung Thaw (*Historical Sites*, p. 32) notes that "these documents by themselves suffice to establish the fact that Theravāda Buddhism was flourishing early at Śrīkṣetra".

Nandapuri

Peter Skilling

¹⁰ See Aung Thaw, *Historical Sites*, pp. 31–32; Nihar-Ranjan Ray, "Early Traces of Buddhism in Burma", *The Journal of the Greater India Society*, Vol. VI–1 (January, 1939), pp. 41–49; U Tha Myat, *Pyu Reader*, Rangoon, 1963; and G.H. Luce, "The Advent of Buddhism to Burma", in L. Cousins *et al.* (ed.), *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner*, Dordrecht and Boston, 1974, pp. 125–27, cf. also H. Falk in J. Stargardt : *The Oldest Known Pāli Texts*. *JPTS* XXI, 1995, pp. 199–217.

Sāriputta and his works

Sāriputta was one of the most prominent monks of the Polonnaruva Period:¹ he composed several texts in Pāli, Sanskrit and Sinhala. He was a disciple of Diśibulāgala Mahākassapa, the first known *saṅgharāja* of Ceylon,² and one of the most important members of Parakkamabāhu's great council of *theras*, the date of which is

Abbreviations and the system for citing Pāli sources follow the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* (Epilegomena to vol. 1, 1948, pp. 5*-36*, and vol. 3, 1992, pp. II-VI) and H. Bechert, *Abkürzungsverzeichnis zur buddhistischen Literatur in Indien und Südostasien* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990). The only exception being PTS editions, which are cited without edition or date, e.g. Sv-pt = Sv-pt (*Sumanāgalavilāsinīpurāṇāṭikā*) Ee 1970 I-III, edited by Lily de Silva.

I would like to thank Prof. R.F. Gombrich, Prof. Oskar von Hinüber and Mr. Royce Wiles, who carefully read this article, for their helpful suggestions and corrections.

¹PLC, pp. 190-192; O.H. de A. Wijesekera, "Pali and Sanskrit in the Polonnaruva Period" in *The Polonnaruva Period* (Dehiwala: Tisara Prakasakayo, 1973), pp. 104, 107; S. Saparamadu, "The Sinhalese Language and Literature of the Polonnaruva Period", *ibid*, p. 120; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādī Bauddhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candraṭilaka, 1960), pp. 77-83.

²Mhv LXXVIII 6, 16, 57; Saddhamma-s 59, 7; Sās Ne 1961 25, 4; PLC, pp. 176-77; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādī Bauddhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candraṭilaka, 1960), pp. 75-77; H. Bechert, *Buddhismus, Staat und Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt: Alfred Metzner Verlag, 1966), vol. 1, p. 265; S. Jayawardhana, *Handbook of Pali Literature* (Colombo: Karunaratne & Sons Ltd, 1994), pp. 79-80. Cf. Mp-ṭ Be 1961 I, 11-16 = Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I 1, 7-12: *Kassapam tam mahātheram saṅghassa parināyakan ... yam nissāya vasanto 'ham vuddhipatto 'smi sāsane*. In Mp-ṭ Be 1961 I 1, 17-20 = Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I 1, 13-16, another teacher of Sāriputta called Sumedha is also mentioned. Mahākassapa and Sumedha were, according to S. Jayawardhana, "the principal and the vice-principal of the Ālāhana Parivena in Jetavana Vihāra" (Op. cit., p. 144, refers to [A.P. Buddhadatta] *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoḍa: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 1, pp. 249-252, 260-262).

“tentatively fixed at 1165 A.D.”³ Diṁbulāgala Mahākassapa, who was in charge of the reformation of the Buddhist order under the patronage of king Parakkamabāhu I (1153-86),⁴ was appointed by the king himself to organise and preside over the great council of *theras* to reform the Buddhist order and establish the Vinaya rules. After the council held under the presidency of Mahākassapa *thera* many *tiikās* were written,⁵ and one of the most important authors was Sāriputta, “perhaps brightest among the constellations that adorned Ceylon’s literary firmament during Parākrama-Bāhu’s reign.”⁶ On account of his erudition he was called Sāgaramati,⁷ “like the ocean in wisdom”, and was “like all the other learned men of his period, a clever Sanskrit scholar as well.”⁸ Perhaps he was the immediate successor of Mahākassapa as *saṅgharāja* of Ceylon⁹ and was very influential with a large circle of disciples such as Vācissara, Sumaṅgala and Dhammadikī, who were famous Pāli authors and

³V. Panditha, “Buddhism During the Polonnaruva Period” in *The Polonnaruva Period* (Dehiwala: Tisara Prakasakayo, 1973), p. 137; see also W. Geiger, “Introduction” in *Mhv Trsl.*, pp. xxviii-xxix; Geiger, § 31, n. 4.

⁴Saddhamma-s 58, 13-14; Sās Ne 1961 25, 4-5; *Mhv LXXVIII* 6. On the reform of the Buddhist order during the reign of Parakkamabāhu I see also Saddhamma-s 58-59; *Mhv LXXIII* 11-22; LXXVIII 1-30; Sās Ne 1961 25, 1-12; PLC, pp. 176-77; W. Geiger, *Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1960), p. 209, § 202; W. Geiger, *Mhv Trsl. (Cūlavāmsa)*, vol. 2, p. 102, n. 2; V. Panditha, “Buddhism During the Polonnaruva Period” in *The Polonnaruva Period* (Dehiwala: Tisara Prakasakayo, 1973), pp. 136-138; H. Bechert, “The Nikāyas of Medieval Sri Lankā and the Unification of the Saṅgha by Parākramabāhu I” in *Studies on Buddhism in Honour of A.K. Warder*, Toronto 1993, pp. 11-21.

⁵Saddhamma-s 58, 27 - 60, 24; PLC, pp. 192-194.

⁶PLC, p. 190.

⁷Saddhamma-s 63, 15.

⁸PLC, p. 190.

⁹H. Bechert, *Buddhismus, Staat und Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt: Alfred Metzner Verlag, 1966), vol. 1, p. 265.

religious leaders.¹⁰ Sāriputta resided in the Jetavana Vihāra¹¹ at Polonnaruva in a “vast and glorious *pāsāda* with rooms, terraces and chambers”¹² which the king had specially built for him.

The writing of the *tīkās* on the canonical texts most probably started very soon after the convocation, because according to Saddhamma-s, it was completed in one year.¹³ “The *tīkās* were sub-commentaries, that is to say, works containing expositions of points in the *Atthakathā* or commentaries which needed further elucidation for correct interpretation; or sometimes they merely gave additional information regarding the discussions in the commentaries, e.g. more illustrative stories.”¹⁴ In the chapter where the writing of the *tīkās* is described Saddhamma-s¹⁵ does not name the authors of the *tīkās*: “Sāriputta’s name is not mentioned, and no special works are assigned to

¹⁰For a detailed discussion on Sāriputta’s disciples and their works see PLC, pp. 198- 219 (Sāriputta’s Circle); Geiger, §§ 32-34.

¹¹Mp-ṭ Be 1961 III 370, 24 = Sp-ṭ Be 1960 III 496, 11 = Pālim Be 1960 468, 12; *sītalūdakasampanne vasam Jetavane imam*. See also Abhidh-s-mhṭ 212, 1-4; *Abhidharmārthaśaṅgrahaya Sanna*, ed. by Paññāmoli Tissa, 3rd ed. (Ambalamgoḍa: W.E. de Silva, H.S. de Silva and R.C.P.W. Vaidyaratna, Vijaya Printing Press, 1926, B.E. 2469), p. 257, v. 1; Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 235.

¹²W. Geiger, Mhv Trsl. (*Cūlavāmsa*), vol. 2, p. 105; Mhv LXXVIII 34: *thirasilassa therassa Sāriputtavhayassa pi, hammiyatthalagabbhehi mahā-pāsādam ujjalam*.

¹³Saddhamma-s 60, 26-28: *ayam piṭakaṭṭhakathāya atthavaṇṇanā ekasāmyvaccharen’ eva niṭṭhitā*.

¹⁴PLC, p. 192. On the etymology of the word *tīkā* and on the evolution of *tīkā* literature see Lily de Silva, “General Introduction” in Sv-ṭ, pp. xxviii-xli; on the methods of exegesis in the sub-commentaries see S. Na Bangchang, “Introduction” in *A Critical Edition of the Mūlapariyāyavagga of Majjhimanikāya-attakathātīkā* (unpublished Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Peradeniya, 1981), pp. cxxviii-cxli. See also K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983), pp. 148-51.

¹⁵Saddhamma-s 58, 27 - 60, 24.

him.”¹⁶ In the next chapter Saddhamma-s gives a list of many authors, among them Sāriputta is mentioned, under the name Sāgaramati, as the author of *Vinayasaṅgaha* (Pālim).¹⁷ According to G.P. Malalasekera “the *ṭīkās* may be regarded as the work of a school, rather than of single individuals” and Sāriputta “may possibly have been appointed to supervise certain sections of the work - the *Vinaya*, *Aīguttara* and *Majjhima* portions.”¹⁸ Whatever the truth may be, Sāriputta is mentioned in the bibliographical texts and in the colophons of the works of his disciples as the author of the following works:

1. *Sāratthadīpanī Vinayaṭīkā* (Sp-t)
2. *Ānguttaranikāyaṭīkā, Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā* (Mp-t)
3. *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasaṅgaha* (Pālim)
4. *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasaṅgahaṭīkā* (Pālim-vn-t)
5. *Pañcikālaṅkāra*
6. *Abhidharmārthasaṅgrahaya Sanna* (Abhidh-s-sn)

¹⁶PLC, p. 193.

¹⁷Saddhamma-s 63, 15-16: *Sāgaramatināmena therena racitam idam, Vinayasamgaḥam nāma vinayatthappakāsanam.*

¹⁸PLC, p. 194; cf. also Geiger § 31. *Majjhimanikāyapurāṇaṭīkā, Dutiya Līnatthapakāsini* (Ps-pt) is ascribed to Dhammapāla; for further discussion on the authorship of Ps-pt see S. Na Bangchang, “Introduction” in *A Critical Edition of the Mūlapariyāyavagga of Majjhimanikāya-aṭṭhakathāṭīkā* (unpublished Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Peradeniya, 1981), pp. xxiv-xxxix, see also H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Upās, p. 47, n. 154. In CPD, Epilegomena to vol. 1, p. 40*, 2.2.12, *Majjhimanikāyaṭīkā, Dutiyā Sāratthamañjūsā* (Ps-t) is ascribed to Sāriputta of Poñonnaruva, but no further evidence is given. According to Saddhamma-s 59, 23-35, the four *ṭīkās* with a common name *Sāratthamañjūsā* (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t, Mp-t) were written by the “elders” (*therā bhikkhū*) during the reign of Parakkamabāhu I (1153-86). As far as I am aware no research has been done yet on the authorship of *Majjhimanikāyaṭīkā, Dutiyā Sāratthamañjūsā* (Ps-t).

7. *Visuddhipathasaṅgaha*
8. *Kammaṭṭhānasaṅgaha*
9. *Maṅgalasuttaṭīkā*
10. *Sampasādanī*
11. *Padāvatāra.*

1. *Sāratthadīpanī Vinayatīkā* (Sp-ṭ).¹⁹ This is the second *ṭīkā* on Buddhaghosa's *Samantapāsādikā* on *Vinayapiṭaka*, written at the request of king Parakkamabāhu I;²⁰ the first *ṭīkā* was written by

¹⁹Gv 61, 30-31; 71, 10-14; Sās Ne 1961 31, 13; Sās-dip Ce 1880, v. 1201; *Piṭakat-samuinī*³ (Piṭ-sm) 239; Don Martino de Zilva Wickremasinghe, "Introduction" in *Catalogue of the Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London: The British Museum, 1900), p. xv; PLC, p. 192; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoḍa: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 1, pp. 249-252; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādī Bauddhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candraṭilaka, 1960), p. 78; Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), pp. 172-173 (§§ 373-374).

Besides the *Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana* edition (Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I-III) there are four earlier printed editions of Sp-ṭ (Be 1904 I-II, 1910-11 I-IV, 1913 I-IV, 1915-18 I-IV) listed in L.D. Barnett, *A Supplementary Catalogue of the Sanskrit, Pāli and Prakrit Books in the Library of the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1906-28), vol. 2, column 946; CPD, Epilegomena to vol. 1, p. 38*, 1.2,12 mentions Be 1902-24 I-IV and Ce 1914 ad Sp I 1, 1 - II 516, 17. In *Laṅkavē puskola pot nāmāvaliya* (LPP), vol. 1, p. 101, s.v. (*Samantapāsādikā Dutiyā ṭīkā*), *Dutiyā Vinayatīkā*, *Sāratthadīpanī*, *Mahā Sāratthadīpanī*, vol. 2, p. 76, s.v. *Samantapāsādikā Majjhimaṭīkā*, *Vinayamahāṭīkā*, *Mahā Sāratthadīpanī*, *Sāratthadīpanī* many MSS. of Sp-ṭ are listed; see also V. Fausböll, "Catalogue of the Mandalay MSS. in the India Office Library" (Formerly part of the King's Library at Mandalay), *JPTS* (1894-96), pp. 12-13, MSS. 14-16; A. Cabaton, *Catalogue sommaire des manuscrits sanscrits et pālis* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale, 1908), fasc. 2, p. 9, Ms. 45; W.A. de Silva, *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum* (Colombo: Ceylon Government Press, 1938), p. 5, MSS. 14-15.

²⁰Sp-ṭ Be 1960 III 496, 6: *ajjhesito narindena, so 'ham Parakkamabāhunā.*

Vajirabuddhi, who “most likely lived in the late Anurādhapura period,”²¹ and is called *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* (Vjb). In the colophon of *Abhidhammatthavibhāvinīṭikā* (Abhidh-s-mht) written by Sumaṅgala, one of Sāriputta’s disciples,²² the author praises his teacher and mentions *Sāratthadīpanī* (Sp-t) as his most important work:

having been supported by the compassion of Sāriputta *thera*, who possesses many virtues most excellent and firm, and whose commentaries on *Vinayaṭṭhakathā* and so on – the foremost among which is *Sāratthadīpanī* – show here the greatness of his knowledge and gladden good people with explanations of the essence of sweet meaning...²³

A Pagan inscription dated 1442 A.D. (B.E. 804) mentions two *Vinayatikās*: (1) *tīgā pārājikan*, identified by G.H. Luce and Tin Htway²⁴

²¹H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Upās, p. 54. According to Lily de Silva (“General Introduction” in Sv-pt, p. xxxviii) Vajirabuddhi lived in the 11th century, but see W.B. Bollée, “Die Stellung der Vinayaṭikās in der Pāli-Literatur”, *ZDMG*, Suppl. 1, 17 (1969): pp. 824-835.

²²PLC, p. 200; Geiger, § 32, 4; H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Abhidh-s and Abidh-s-mht, pp. xviii-xix.

²³Abhidh-s-mht 212, 9-14: *ñāñānubhāvam iha yassa ca sūcayantī samvannanā ca vinayaṭṭhakathādikānam Sāratthadīpanīmukhā Madhuratthasāra-sandīpanena sujanam paritosayantī. tass’ ānukampam avalambiya Sāriputtatherassa thāmagatasāraguṇākarassa...* (R.F. Gombrich suggests *Sāratthadīpanī*- m.c.; *Madhuratthasāra-* or *madhuratthasāra-* ?). Cf. the colophon of *Abhidharmārthasāraṅgrahaya Sanna* at the end of this article, where the most complete list of Sāriputta’s works is given. See also Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 235.

²⁴G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, “A 15th Century Inscription and Library at Pagan, Burma” in *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume* (Colombo: The Malalasekera Commemoration Volume Editorial Committee, 1976), p. 218, Ms. 9; cf. PLB, p. 102, where the title of the Ms. 9 is mentioned as *Pārājikakāṇḍa-ṭikā*.

as “*Pārājika/kānda*” sub-commentary *Sāratthadīpanī*”, and (2) *tiṅgā terasakan* which is identified as “[*Samghādisesakaṇḍa*] Rules sub-commentary”²⁵ which seems also to be a part of *Sāratthadīpanī*.²⁶

2. *Ānguttaranikāya-tiṅkā, Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā* (Mp-ṭ).²⁷

In this *tiṅkā* six verses of the prologue are nearly identical with six verses

²⁵G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, as preceding note, p. 219, Ms. 10; cf. PLB, p. 102 where the title of the Ms. 10 is mentioned as *Terasakan-tiṅkā*. Piṭ-sm 240 lists *terasakan* *tiṅkā*, and the preceding *tiṅkā* - which corresponds to *tiṅgā pārājikan* in the inscription - is mentioned as *Sāratthadīpanī* (Piṭ-sm 239).

²⁶Cf. the Ms. in the India Office Library with the title *Terasakan tiṅkā pāṭh* which ends with: *ettāvatā ca, Vinaye pāṭavattāya ... Vinayat̄ akathāya sā, Sāratthadīpanī nāma sabbaso parinīthitā ... Terasakanḍavannanā nīthitā* (see V. Fausböll, “Catalogue of the Mandalay MSS. in the India Office Library” (Formerly part of the King’s Library at Mandalay), *JPTS* (1894-96), pp. 12-13, Ms. 16).

²⁷Gv 61, 32-33; 71, 11-14; Sās Ne 1961 31, 13; Sās-dip Ce 1880, v. 1201; Piṭ-sm 202-212 (cf. 239); PLC, pp. 192, 194-195; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pāṭisāhiṭiyaya* (Ambalamgoda: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 1, pp. 260-262; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādī Bauddhācāryayā* (Ambalamgoda: S.K. Candraṭilaka, 1960), p. 78; Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāṭi Literature* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), p. 173 (§§ 375-376).

Besides the *Chatṭhasaṅgāyana* edition (Mp-ṭ Be 1961 I-III) there exist the following three earlier editions of Mp-ṭ: Be 1910 I-II (see CPD, Epilegomena to vol. I, p. 41*, 2.4,12); Ce 1907 (see W.A. de Silva, “A List of Pali Books Printed in Ceylon in Sinhalese Characters”, *JPTS* (1910-12), p. 150; not listed in CPD, Epilegomena to vol. I, p. 41*, 2.4,12); Ce 1930 (see EncBuddh, vol. 1, fasc. 4, p. 629, s.v. *Ānguttara-nava-tiṅkā*; not listed in CPD, Epilegomena to vol. I, p. 41*, 2.4,12). Mp-ṭ Ce 1907 contains most of *Ekanipāṭa-tiṅkā* (cf. Mp-ṭ Be 1961 I 1,1 - 254,17) and Ce 1930 contains the entire *Ekanipāṭa-tiṅkā*. The Mss. of Mp-ṭ are listed in: LPP, vol 1, p. 2 (5 Mss. in Sinhala script), vol. 2, p. 1 (7 Mss. in Sinhala script), vol. 3, p. 164 (1 Ms. in Burmese script from the British Museum, Or 2089); W. A. de Silva, *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum* (Colombo: Ceylon Government Press, 1938), vol. I, p. 37 (1 Ms. in Sinhala script); Piṭ-sm 202-212 (1 Ms. in Burmese script). For a detailed description of the editions and some of the above mentioned Mss. of

in the prologue of the *Sāratthadīpanī*,²⁸ the colophons are also very similar²⁹ and the first few pages of both texts likewise show very few differences.³⁰ These similarities could be evidence of common authorship.

It is also interesting to note that although the first few pages of Mp-ṭ (and Sp-ṭ) are quite different from the introductory pages of the *purāṇaṭīkās* on DN, MN and SN (Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ³¹) written Dhammapāla, all the four *nikāyaṭīkās* (Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ, Mp-ṭ) have many parallel passages.³²

Mp-ṭ see P. Pecenko, "Introduction" in *Āṅguttaraṭīkā, Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā*, vol. 1 (Mp-ṭ Ee (PTS) 1996).

Piṭ-sm 199-201 also lists an incomplete manuscript of the "old" (*hoñ³*) *ṭīkā* on *Āṅguttaranikāya* (Mp-ṭ, see CPD, Epilegomena to vol. I, p. 41*, 2.4,11), which is, according to Piṭ-sm (1989 edition), at present held in the National Library, Rangoon (note on Piṭ-sm 1 informs us that all the entries which are marked by an asterisk - and Piṭ-sm 199-201 are marked by an asterisk - are held in the National Library, previously Bernard Free Library; see also H. Bechert et al., *Burmese Manuscripts* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1979), Part 1, p. XXXIV). The manuscript contains only *Eka*-, *Duka*- and *Tika**ṅguttaraṭīkā*. In a letter dated 10 October 1995 Prof. U Ko Lay informs me that "the old *Āṅguttaraṭīkās* appear to be out of use in Myanmar monasteries for a long time". Cf. also Oskar von Hinüber, Op. cit., pp. 167 (§ 357), 173 (§ 376).

²⁸These are verses 2-7 in the prologue of Mp-ṭ, and verses 4-9 in the prologue of Sp-ṭ, see Mp-ṭ Be 1961 I 1, 11-2, 2 and Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I 1, 7 - 2, 2.

²⁹The colophons differ only in the first two verses, see Mp-ṭ Be 1961 III 370, 15 - 371, 8 and Sp-ṭ Be 1960 III 496, 2-23.

³⁰Cf. Mp-ṭ Be 1961 I 3, 7 - 5, 14 and Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I 2, 18 - 5, 7.

³¹Sv-ṭ = *Sumaṅgalavilāsinīpurāṇaṭīkā*; Ps-ṭ = *Papañcasūdanīpurāṇaṭīkā*; Spk-ṭ = *Sāratthapakāsinīpurāṇaṭīkā*.

³²The introductory portions in these four *ṭīkās* are similar because they comment on the introductory verses in Sv I, 1 - 2, 9; Ps I 1, 1 - 2, 13; Spk I 1, 1 - 2, 21 and Mp I 1, 1 - 3, 3, which are identical in most cases. Mp-ṭ is nevertheless quite different from the other three *ṭīkās* because: 1) it has the introductory verses which the other three *ṭīkās* do not have (six verses are the same as in Sp-ṭ, see

Continues...

3. *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasaṅgaha* (Pālim).³³ According to G.P. Malalasekera this is purely the work of Sāriputta himself and not the work of an assembly of *ṭīkā* compilers under the supervision of Sāriputta as is the case with Mp-ṭ and Sp-ṭ.³⁴ The colophon of Pālim is

above note 28); 2) the prose passage following the verses is much more similar to Sp-ṭ (and Sv-nt) than to the other three *ṭīkās*; 3) the *Netti* method applied to the first *sutta* in each of the four *nikāyāṭīkās* (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-ṭ) is much longer in Mp-ṭ. See also "Table of Parallel Passages" in P. Pecenko, *Ānguttaranikāyāṭīkā, Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā: Ganthārambhakathā, Ganthārambhakathāvanṇanā, Rūpādivaggavaṇṇanā* (unpublished Ph.D. diss., The Australian National University, 1994), pp. 330-343.

³³Saddhamma-s 63, 15-16; Gv 61, 31; 71, 10-14; Sās Ne 1961 31, 22; Sās-dip Ce 1880, v. 1201; Piṭ-sm 260 (cf. 239); Geiger, § 31; de Zilva Wickremasinghe, as note 19, p. xv; PLC, pp. 190-192; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoḍa: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 2, pp. 297-298; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādī Bauddhācāryayā* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candraṭilaka, 1960), p. 78; Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), p. 158 (§§ 334-335).

Besides the Chaṭṭhaśaṅgāyaṇa edition (Pālim Be 1960) there are three earlier printed editions of Pālim (two Be 1909, Ce 1913) listed in L.D. Barnett, *A Supplementary Catalogue of the Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit Books in the Library of the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1906-28), vol. 2, columns 945-946. The MSS. of Pālim are listed in: V. Fausböll, "Catalogue of the Mandalay MSS. in the India Office Library" (Formerly part of the King's Library at Mandalay), *JPTS* (1894-96), pp. 117-18, Ms. 30; A Cabaton, *Catalogue sommaire des manuscrits sanscrits et pālis* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale, 1908), fasc. 2, pp. 52, 80, 152, MSS. 255, 377, 713; W.A. de Silva, *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum* (Colombo: Ceylon Government Press, 1938), pp. 8-9, MSS. 23-25; C.E. Godakumbura, *Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts* (Copenhagen: The Royal Library, 1980), pp. 52-54, Ms. 30; H. Braun et al., *Burmese Manuscripts, Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, vol. 23, 2 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1985), p. 159, Ms. 340; Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, pp. 319-320, Ms. Or. 6601(57).

³⁴PLC, pp. 194-195.

very similar to the colophons of Sp-ṭ and Mp-ṭ,³⁵ all three works were written at the request of king Parakkamabāhu I in the Jetavana Vihāra in Polonnaruva. The work has been known under several different titles: *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasaṅgaha*, *Vinayasaṅgahaṭṭhakathā*, *Vinaya-saṅgaha*, *Vinayasaṅgahapakaraṇa*.³⁶ In *Laṅkavē puskola pot nāmāvaliya* (LPP) several names for Pālim are also given: *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasaṅgaha*, *Pālimuttakaya*, *Pālimuttakavinaya*, *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchaya*, *Mahāvinayasaṅgaha*, *Vinayasaṅgaha*.³⁷ *Piṭakatsamuiñ*³ (Piṭ-sm) 260 gives it under the name *Vinayasaṅgahaṭṭhakathā*, which seems to be the correct title, since it was “a summary of the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, divided into various sections, giving the explanations of *Vinaya* rules.”³⁸ On the title page of Pālim Be 1960 the following title is given: “*Pālimuttakavinayavincchayasaṅgaho*” *ti pi voharitā Vinayasaṅgaha-ṭṭhakathā*. In the Pagan inscription two MSS. are mentioned.³⁹ *vineñ saṅgruiw krī*, which is identified as *Vinayamahāsaṅgaha*, and *vineñ saṅgruiw nay*, identified as *Vinayasaṅgaha*. Similarly Piṭ-sm lists first *Vinayasaṅgaha-ṭṭhakathā*, written by Sāriputta,⁴⁰ which obviously corresponds to the “greater” (*krī*) *Vinayamahāsaṅgaha* mentioned in the inscription as *vineñ saṅgruiw krī*.

³⁵Cf. Pālim Be 1960 468, 8-21; Mp-ṭ Be 1961 III 370, 15 - 371, 8; Sp-ṭ Be 1960 III 496, 2-23.

³⁶PLC, p. 191. In Somadasa, Cat (vol. 1, p. 233) it is also mentioned as *Vinaya-vinicchaya* (Vin-vn) which is a mistake because Vin-vn was written by Buddhadatta; see Vin-vn (Ee 1927), ed. by A.P. Buddhadatta. On the term *pālimuttaka* see Steven Collins, “On the very idea of the Pali canon”, *JPTS* 15 (1990), p. 92.

³⁷LPP, vol. 1, p. 58; vol. 2, p. 44 (lists many MSS. of Pālim in the temple libraries in Sri Lanka).

³⁸PLC, p. 190.

³⁹G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, as above note 24, p. 219, MSS. 11, 12. Cf. PLB, p. 102 where these two texts are called “*Vinayasaṅgaha-ṭṭhakathā* (the greater)” (Ms. 11) and “*Vinayasaṅgaha-ṭṭhakathā* (the less)” (Ms. 12).

⁴⁰Piṭ-sm 260.

Then it mentions two MSS. of *Vinayasaṅgaha* *atthakathā*,⁴¹ which correspond to the “lesser” (*nay*) *Vinayasaṅgaha* mentioned in the inscription as *vineñ saṅgruiw nay*. Also among the titles of Pālim given in LPP⁴² are *Mahāvinayasaṅgaha* and *Vinayasaṅgaha*, which seem to correspond to the “greater” (*krī*) and the “lesser” (*nay*) *Vinayasaṅgaha* listed in the Pagan inscription and in Piṭ-sm. Are these two different texts or just two names for the same text? In the Burmese sources they are mentioned as different but in LPP they are just two names of Pālim. Malalasekera explains this “variety of the titles” as follows:

It has been suggested in view of the variety of the titles under which the book is known that *Vinayasaṅgaha*, or, to give its full name, *Pālimuttaka-Vinayavinicchayasaṅgaha*, was only part of a much larger *Mahā-Vinayasaṅgahapakarana*, but I see no reason to accept this suggestion. It is only too well known that the work of ancient authors often bore more than one title - sometimes confusedly so - and it is quite likely that Sāriputta’s work was no exception to this custom and that whatever its full and original name was, it was generally called the *Vinayasaṅgaha*.⁴³

4. *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasaṅgahatikā* (Pālim-vn-t), also *Vinayasaṅgahapurāṇatikā*, a *tikā* on *Vinayasaṅgaha* (Pālim), which some sources also ascribe to Sāriputta.⁴⁴ According to Malalasekera

⁴¹Piṭ-sm 261-62. According to Piṭ-sm there are no MSS. of this text available in Burma (see above note 27). Piṭ-sm 262 ascribes it to Cañ¹ Kū³ of Ratanapura (Ava); cf. PLC, p. 191.

⁴²LPP, vol. 1, p. 58, vol. 2, p. 44.

⁴³PLC, p. 191.

⁴⁴Gv 61, 32; 71, 11; Piṭ-sm 291 (cf. 239); de Zilva Wickremasinghe, as note 19, p. xv; PPN, vol. 2, p. 884; Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), p. 158 (§§ 336).

“two *ṭīkās* are extant in Ceylon, one old (*purāṇa*) and the other one new (*nava*), but the author and the date of neither is known”.⁴⁵ In the colophon of *Abhidharmārthasaṅgrahaya Sanna* (Abhidh-s-sn) it is also mentioned that Sāriputta is the author of both *Vinayasaṅgaha* and the *ṭīkā* on it:

... virtuous *guru*, monk Sāriputta, wrote *Vinayasaṅgaha* to help those who practice contemplation, and he also composed its commentary on the words which have hidden meaning ...⁴⁶

5. *Pañcikālaṅkāra*. This is a Sanskrit work, a *ṭīkā* on Ratnamati's *Cāndravyākaranaṭīkā*, also called *Cāndrapañcikā*.⁴⁷ This

A Sinhalese printed edition of Pālim-vn-ṭ (Ce 1908 edited by K. Paññāsāra) is listed in L.D. Barnett, *A Supplementary Catalogue of the Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit Books in the Library of the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1906-28), vol. 2, column 946; also CPD, Epilegomena to vol. 1, p. 39*, 1.3.5.1. A Ms. of the *Pālimuttaka Ṭīkā* is given in W.A. de Silva, *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum* (Colombo: Ceylon Government Press, 1938), p. 9, Ms. 26; LPP, vol. 1, p. p. 58, s.v. *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasaṅgahapurāṇaṭīkā*, vol. 2, p. 44, s.v. *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasaṅgahapurāṇaṭīkā, anuttāna-atthadīpanī, anuttānapadavāṇṇanā* lists several Mss. of Pālim-vn-ṭ. There is another *ṭīkā* on Pālim written by Tipiṭakālaṅkāra (1578-1651) called *Vinayālaṅkāraṭīkā*, see PLB, p. 54; Geiger § 43; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoda: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 2, pp. 298-300; Oskar von Hinüber, Op. cit., p. 158 (§ 337).

⁴⁵PLC, p. 191. These two *ṭīkās* on Pālim are most probably Pālim-vn-ṭ, ascribed to Sāriputta, and *Vinayālaṅkāraṭīkā*, written by Tipiṭakālaṅkāra.

⁴⁶Text at the end of this article, vv. 2-3:*Sārisutena yatinā gurunā guṇena yoginam upakārāya kato Vinayasaṅgaho ten' eva racitā c' assa līnatthapadavāṇṇanā*. According to Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 233, the colophon was written by Sāriputta himself; *līnatthapadavāṇṇanā* in the colophon is read *Līnatthapadavāṇṇanā* (ibid, p. 235) and taken as “*Līnatthapadavāṇṇanā* (on *Papañcasūdanī*)” (ibid, p. 233) which is not correct (see above note 18). Cf. Dāṭh VI 2 quoted below.

work seems to be lost.⁴⁸ Ratnamati's *Cāndravyākaraṇaṭīkā* is also mentioned in the Pagan inscription as *Candrapañcikā*: "Word-for-word commentary on Candra's grammar".⁴⁹ Dhammadikitti, one of Sāriputta's immediate disciples,⁵⁰ mentions in the colophon of his *Dāṭhāvamṣa* (Dāṭh), a poem composed in the beginning of 13th century,⁵¹ four of the above mentioned works of Sāriputta:

he who wrote the praised *ṭīkā* on the *pañjikā* to the excellent grammar composed by Candragomin, and a *ṭīkā* on the *Vinaya* commentary *Samantapāsādikā*, which produces the power of

⁴⁸Gv 61, 33 (where the *Pañcakā* is mentioned as one of the five works of Sāriputta); 71, 15-16 (*sakaṭasaddasatthassa Pañcikā nāma ṭīkāgandho attano matiyā Sāriputtācariyena kato*); Sās-dip Ce 1880, v. 1203 (*Pañcikāya tu ṭīkāpi dhimatā kaviketunā, therena Sāriputtena katā parahitathinā*); Piṭ-sm 1124 (mentions *Candrikāpañcikāṭīkā* written by Sāriputra, the author of *Sāratthādīpanīṭīkā*; cf. also Piṭ-sm 239); de Zilva Wickremasinghe, as note 19, pp. xiii, xv; PLC, p. 190 (mentions *Ratnamatipañjikāṭīkā* or *Pañjikālāṅkāra*); A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādī Bauddhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candraśilaka, 1960), p. 78, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoḍa: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 1, p. 251; Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 233; H. Bechert, "Sanskrit-Grammatiken in singhalesischer Überlieferung", StII 13/14 (1987) [Festschrift W. Rau], pp. 8-10 (mentions Ratnaśrījñāna or Ratnamatipāda, also known as Ratnaśrīpāda, as the author of *Candrapañcikā*, also *Ratnamatipañjikā*).

On *Cāndravyākaraṇaṭīkā* see Th. Oberlies, "Verschiedene neu-entdeckte Texte des Cāndravyākaraṇa und ihre Verfasser (Studien zum Cāndravyākaraṇa II)", StII 16 (1992), pp. 164-168, and "Das zeitliche und ideengeschichtliche Verhältnis der Cāndra-Vṛtti zu anderen V(ai)yākaraṇas (Studien zum Cāndravyākaraṇa III)", StII 20 (1996) [Festschrift Paul Thieme], pp. 265-275.

⁴⁹A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoḍa: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 1, p. 251; H. Saddhatissa, "Introduction" in Upās, p. 46; H. Bechert, as note 47, p. 10. No MSS. are mentioned in Piṭ-sm 1124 and LPP.

⁵⁰G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, as above note 24, p. 239, Ms. no. 203. Cf. PLB, p. 107, where Ms. 201 is given as *Candrapañcikara [-pañjikā]*, and p. 107, n. 3.

⁵¹Dāṭh VI 4-6; PLC, p. 195.

⁵²Geiger, § 34, 1.

wisdom, wrote a *ṭīkā* on the excellent commentary on *Ānguttaranikāya*, which destroys the restlessness of delusion, and a book called *Vinayasāṅgaha* for the multitude of those who are self-controlled and are exerting themselves in meditation.⁵²

6. *Abhidharmārthasaṅgrahaya Sanne* (Abhidh-s-sn). This is a paraphrase of *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha* in Sinhala which is ascribed to Sāriputta,⁵³ who according to Hugh Nevill⁵⁴ “calls his own work the *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha Sīhalatthavannanā*”. There exist several manuscripts⁵⁵ and at least four printed editions⁵⁶ of this work.

⁵²Dāṭh VI 1-2: *yo Candragomiracite varasaddasatthe ṭīkām pasattham akarittha ca Pañcikāya buddhipabhāvajanani ca akā Samantapāśādikāya vinayaṭīkātthakathāya ṭīkām Ānguttarāgamavaraṭīkātthakathāya ṭīkām sammohavibbhamavighātakarīm akāsi athāya samyamiganassa padhānikassa gantham akā Vinayasāṅgahanāmadheyam.*

⁵³Sās-dip Ce 1880, v. 1202; de Zilva Wickremasinghe, as above note 19, p. xv; PLC, p. 192; CPD, Epilegomena to vol. 1, p. 50*, 3.8.1, (6): *Abhidharmārthasaṅgrahavistarasnaya*; H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Abhidh-s and Abhidh-s-mhṭ, p. xviii; “Introduction” in Upās, p. 46. Cf. also Piṭ-sm 239.

⁵⁴Descriptive catalogue of the Hugh Nevill collection (HNP), compiled by Hugh Nevil, p. 21, quoted in Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 233.

⁵⁵W.A. de Silva, as above note 19, p. 266, Ms. 1743 (*Abhidharmārtha Sangraha Sanne*); Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, pp. 233-36, MSS. 6601(1), 6601(2) (*Abhidhammatthasaṅgahapurāṇasannaya*); LPP, vol. 1, p. 6, s.v. *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha Sannaya* (many MSS.), vol. 2, p. 5, s.v. *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha Sannaya*, *Abhidharmārthasaṅgraha Sannaya* (many MSS.).

⁵⁶First edition: Ce 1897, ed. by T. Paññamoli Tissa with the help of M. Dhammaratana Tissa, Peliyagoda (see L.D. Barnett, *A Supplementary Catalogue of the Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit Books in the Library of the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1906-28), vol. 1, column 42); second edition: Ce 1916, ed. by Paññāmoli Tissa (Ambalamgoda: W.E. de Silva and R.C.P. Weerasuriya, Vijaya Printing Press, 1916); third edition: Ce 1926, ed. by Paññamoli Tissa (Ambalamgoda: W.E. de Silva, H.S. de Silva and R.C.P.W. Vaidyaratna, Vijaya Printing Press, 1926); fourth edition: Ce 1950, ed. by

In the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn⁵⁷ Sāriputta is also mentioned as the author of the following four works:⁵⁸

7. Visuddhipathasaṅgaha.⁵⁹

8. Kammaṭṭhānasaṅgaha.⁶⁰ Piṭ-sm lists *Kammaṭṭhānadīpanī* as the work of Sāriputta, and according to Piṭ-sm⁶¹ a manuscript of this work is held in the National Library, Rangoon. It is not clear if this is the same work as *Kammaṭṭhānasamgaha* which is listed in the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn.

9. Maṅgalasuttatīkā.⁶² Hoerning⁶³ lists a Burmese Pāli manuscript of *Maṅgalasuttatīkā* held in the library of the British

Paññāmoli Tissa, (Colombo: 1950) (see Shingyō Yoshimoto, “On the *Sārasaṅgaha*”, *Bukkyō Kenkyū*, vol. XXIV (1995), p. 131).

⁵⁷See text at the end of this article and also Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 235.

⁵⁸According to A. P. Buddhadatta and H. Saddhatissa the first three works are not known any more and the fourth work, *Sampasādanī*, they do not mention at all; see A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoḍa: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 1, p. 251; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādī Bauddhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Chandratilaka, 1960), p. 78; H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in *Upās*, p. 46.

⁵⁹This work seems to be lost; I could not find any further reference.

⁶⁰LPP, vol. 2, p. 14, s.v. *Kammaṭṭhānasamgaha*, (also called *Duvidhakammatṭhāna*?), lists four MSS. held in the temple libraries in Sri Lanka. Further research is needed here.

⁶¹Piṭ-sm 364 (see also above note 27).

⁶²Cf. text at the end of this article, v. 9: *Maṅgalassa ca suttassa vaṇṇanāya suvannanā, viññūnam likhitā tīkā bhikkhūnam rativaddhanī*. Hugh Nevill, quoted in Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 233, wrongly identifies this work as *Maṅgalasuttavaṇṇanā* (*Maṅgalatthadīpanī*); H. Saddhatissa (“Introduction” in *Upās*, p. 46) calls it *Maṅgalasuttasaṅgaha* which seems to be a mistake (cf. v. 9 quoted above).

Museum. If the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn is correct this could be a work of Sāriputta.

10. *Sampasādanī*. Perhaps this work is related to *Samapasādanīya Suttanta* of DN.⁶⁴ Among the works of unknown authors Gv⁶⁵ lists also *Pasādanī* and *Pasādajanānī*. LPP⁶⁶ lists the following Sinhalese works which could be related to *Sampasādanī*: *Sampasādanīyasuttapada-ānuma*, *Sampasādanīyasuttavyākyāvā*, *Sampasādanīyasuttasannaya*. From the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn it is not clear in which language the *Sampasādanī* was written.

The above four works are mentioned in the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn as follows:

Visuddhipathasaṅgaha [was written] for the forest-dwelling *bhikkhus*, a collection of the objects of meditation [*Kammaṭṭhānasaṅgaha*] for the *bhikkhus*, who contemplate the objects of meditation ... the precious *Sampasādanī* was composed to produce joy for the hearers and for the benefit of the wise ... and a delight-increasing *tikā*, which is a thorough

⁶³Hoerning, "List of Manuscripts in the British Museum", *JPTS* (1883), p. 140, Ms. 17,554 (6 foll. *ka-kū*). LPP, vol. 3, p. 163, s.v. *Maṅgalasuttaṭikā*, wrongly identifies the entire Ms. 17,554 (180 foll.) as *Maṅgalasuttaṭikā*; the Ms. contains two texts: *Maṅgalasuttaṭikā* (first 6 foll. only) and the first half of *Maṅgalatthadipani*. See the unpublished *List of Pali Manuscripts*, [excluding the Nevill Collection (Or. 6599 - 6616)], British Museum, cat. no. B.14. (F.1/f.), London, n.d., p. 8.

⁶⁴DN III 99, 1 - 116, 10.

⁶⁵Gv 62, 34 (*Pasādanī*), 72, 19 (*Pasādajanānī*). Cf. text at the end of this article, v. 6: *pasādajanānathāya ... racitā Sampasādanī*.

⁶⁶LPP, vol. 1, p. 101; vol. 2, p. 76.

exposition of the commentary on *Maṅgalasutta*, was written for wise *bhikkhus*.⁶⁷

11. *Padāvatāra*. This is the only work which is in many secondary sources ascribed to Sāriputta,⁶⁸ but it is not mentioned in the colophon of *Abhidh-s-sn*. This work seems to be lost.⁶⁹ In the Pagan inscription a work called (*padāvasāra*) *mahācat* is mentioned and it is identified by G.H. Luce and Tin Htway as: “*Padāvaha mahacakka?* Query *Padāvatāra*, a Sanskrit work on grammar by Sāriputta (PLC 190), or *Sadāvatāra* (cf. [Ms. no.] 165 above)?”⁷⁰ Bode also mentions the same work but reads it differently: “*Padāvahāmahācakka* [*Padāvatāra?*]”.⁷¹ Sās-dip⁷² ascribes the authorship of *Padāvatāra* to Coliyācariya Sāriputtathera, who according to H. Dhammaratana “lived

⁶⁷See text at the end of this article and cf. Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 235: *Maṅgalassa [ca] suttassa vannanāya suvannanā, vimñūnam likhitā tīkā bhikkhūnaṁ rati vaddhati.*

⁶⁸de Zilva Wickremasinghe, as above note 19, p. xv (refers to the preface to printed edition of the *Moggallāna-pañjikā-pradīpa*); PLC, p. 190 (refers to preface, p. xvi, printed ed. of *Moggallāna-pañjikā-pradīpa*); CPD, Epilegomena to vol. 1, p. 56*, (5.3,3 (refers to 5.3,11(2) (=*Maudgalyāyana-pañcikā-pradīpaya*, Ce 1896), p. XV, 27); C.E. Godakumbura, “Introduction” in *Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts* (Copenhagen: The Royal Library, 1980), p. xxvii and n. 2. See also H. Bechert, “Sanskrit-Grammatiken in singhalesischer Überlieferung”, StII 13/14 (1987) [Festschrift W. Rau], p. 10, note 26.

⁶⁹PLC, p. 190; H. Bechert, as note 68, p. 10;

⁷⁰G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, as above note 24, p. 236, Ms. no. 169.

⁷¹PLB, p. 106, Ms. 169.

⁷²Sās-dip Ce 1880, v. 1244: *Coliyācariyo Sāriputtathero mahāmati, Padāvatāram dhammāvataranatham akā subham*. So also H. Bechert, as note 68, p. 10 and note 26 (refers to *Pañcikāpradīpaya*, p. 236); A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādī Bauddhācāryayā* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), p. 82 (refers to *Pañcikāpradīpaya*).

at Bodhimangai in Chola country".⁷³ This is most probably true, since *Padāvatāra* is the only work which is not mentioned in the colophon of *Abhidh-s-sn*, where the most detailed list of Sāriputta's works is given.⁷⁴

According to Hugh Nevill⁷⁵ and Somadasa⁷⁶ the colophon of *Abhidh-s-sn* was written by Sāriputta himself. Since the list of works given in the colophon is very detailed this suggestion could be correct. In the colophon of *Dāṭh*, written in the beginning of the 13th century by Dhammadikitti, who was one of Sariputta's immediate disciples, only four works in the above list are given: *Sp-t*, *Mp-t*, *Pālim* and *Pañcikālāṅkāra*.⁷⁷ The colophon of *Abhidh-s-mhṭ* written by Sumanāgala, who was also one of Sāriputta's disciples, mentions only *Sāratthadīpanī* (*Sp-t*) as the first work of Sāriputta's "exposition on *Vinayaṭṭhakathā* and so on".⁷⁸ It seems that *Sp-t*, which is mentioned in all three colophons, was considered Sāriputta's "first and foremost work".⁷⁹ All three colophons were most probably written not later than the 13th century.

Saddhammasaṅgaha (*Saddhamma-s*), which was written about AD 1400 in Siam,⁸⁰ ascribes to Sāriputta only one work, i.e. *Pālim*.⁸¹ All

⁷³H. Dhammaratana Thera, *Buddhism in South India*, The Wheel Publication No. 124/125 (Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1968), p. 41. See also PPN, vol. 2, p. 1118.

⁷⁴See text at the end of this article and also Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 235.

⁷⁵Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, pp. 233.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 235.

⁷⁷See the discussion on *Pañcikālāṅkāra* above.

⁷⁸Abhidh-s-mhṭ 212, 13-14: *saṃvannanā ca vinayaṭṭhakathādikānam* *Sāratthadīpanīmukhā*.

⁷⁹H. Saddhatissa, "Introduction" in *Upās*, p. 47. Cf. PLC, p. 192.

⁸⁰H. Penth, "Reflections on the *Saddhammasaṅgaha*", JSS 65, I (1977), pp. 259-280.

the *ṭīkās*, including Sp-ṭ and Mp-ṭ, which are clearly mentioned in the colophons of earlier works (Abhidh-s-sn, Abhidh-s-mhṭ, Dāṭh) as the works of Sāriputta, are in Saddhamma-s ascribed to the “elders” (*therā bhikkhū*) or the “great elders” (*mahātherā*),⁸² who are also mentioned as “the teachers of the *ṭīkās*” (*ṭīkācariyā*).⁸³ Although “it is significant that Sāriputta’s name is not mentioned in this connection, and that no special works are assigned to him by the author of *Saddhammasaṅgaha*”, there is, according to Malalasekera, “no doubt that the account of the *ṭīkā* compilation, as given here [i.e. in Saddhamma-s], contains more than a germ of truth”.⁸⁴ The main aim of the council held during the reign of Parakkamabāhu I and presided over by Diṭṭibulāgala Mahākassapa was to reconcile different communities of *saṅgha* which “had been torn by various schisms”.⁸⁵ Although “they accepted the authority of the common canon and of Buddhaghosa’s commentaries” they “interpreted various points of teaching in their own way” and “these interpretations were written and handed down in [different] *ṭīkās*”.⁸⁶ The council presided over by Mahākassapa realised the need “[to bring] these various

⁸²Saddhamma-s 63, 15-16: *Sāgaramatināmena therena racitam idam, Vinayasamgaḥam nāma vinayatthappakāsanam.*

⁸³Saddhamma-s 59, 14 - 61, 30.

⁸⁴Saddhamma-s 62, 13.

⁸⁵PLC, p. 193. Cf. H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Upās, p. 47.

⁸⁶PLC, p. 193.

⁸⁷PLC, pp. 193-194. Cf. Saddhamma-s 58, 31 - 59, 2: *kattha ci anekesu gaṇṭhipadesu Sihalabhaśāya niruttiyā likhitañ ca kattha ci mūlabhaśāya Māgadhiśāya bhāsantarena sammissam ākulañ ca katvā likhitañ ca; also 61, 10-18. Similarly also Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I 2, 5-16. According to Lily de Silva (“General Introduction” in Sv-ṭ, p. xxxvi) *gaṇṭhipadas* “formed a sort of basis for the compilation of the *ṭīkās* during the Polonnaruva period, and the *ṭīkā* authors openly acclaim their indebtedness to these *gaṇṭhipadas* [see Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I 2, 7-8].”*

ṭīkās together and [make] a synthetic summary of them all".⁸⁷ Therefore according to Malalasekera "these ṭīkās may be regarded as the work of a school, rather than of single individuals",⁸⁸ as also the parallel passages found in many other ṭīkās seem to indicate.

To conclude, I reproduce below the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn,⁸⁹ where all the works of Sāriputta except *Padāvatāra* are mentioned:

ramme *Pulatthinagare* *nagarādhirāje*
raññā *Parakkamabhujena* *mahābhujena*
kārāpite *vasati* *Jetavane* *vihāre*
yo rammahammiyavarūpavanābhīrāme [1]
sabbattha *patthaṭayasena* *visāradena*
suddhāsayena *parisuddhakulodayena*
takkāgamādikusalena *yatissarena*
Sārisutena *yatinā* *gurunā* *guṇena* [2]
yogīnam *upakārāya* *kato* *Vinayasaṅgaho*
ten' eva *racitā* *c' assa* *līnathapadavanñanā* [3]
bhikkhūnam 'raññavāsīnam' *Visuddhipathasaṅgaho*
kammaṭṭhānikabhikkhūnam *kammaṭṭhānassa* *saṅgaho* [4]
Candagomābhīdhānena *racitā* *sādhusammata*
pañcikā *ramanīyenā* 'lañkārena ca *bhūsītā* [5]
pasādajananatthāya *sotūnañ* ca *mahārahā*

⁸⁷PLC, p. 194. According to H. Saddhatissa ("Introduction" in Upās, p. 47, n. 154) "the *Līnathappakāsinī* on Buddhaghosa's commentaries to the four *Nikāyas* written earlier by Dhammapāla might surely have been consulted in this recompilation of ṭīkās".

⁸⁸PLC, p. 194.

⁸⁹*Abhidharmārthaṅgrahaya Sanna*, ed. by Paññāmoli Tissa, 3rd ed. (Ambalamgoḍa: W.E. de Silva, H.S. de Silva and R.C.P.W. Vaidyaratna, Vijaya Printing Press, 1926, B.E. 2469), p. 257; cf. Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 235. For other editions of Abhidh-s-sn, see n. 56 above.

viññūnañ ca hitatthāya racitā Sampasādanī [6]
 Vinayaṭṭhakathāyāpi suvisuddhapadakkamā
 tiñā viracitā rammā vinayaññupasamsitā [7]
 Añguttaranikāyaṭṭhakathāya ca anākulā
 bhikkhūnam paṭubhāvāya tiñā pi ca susañkhatā [8]
 Mañgalassa ca suttassa vaññanāya suvaññanā
 viññūnam likhitā tiñā bhikkhūnam rativaddhanti⁹⁰ [9]
 kañkhāvinayanatthāya Abhiddhammathasañgahē
 bhikkhūnam likhitam gantham Sīhañāya niruttiyā [10]
 Parakkamanarindassa narindakulaketuno⁹¹
 nāmena tilakam vuttam nakkhattapathanissitam [11]
 yam cande⁹² Candabhūtam nisitataramatim Pāñinim pāñinīye
 sabbasmim takkasatthe paṭutaramatayo kattubhūtam va tan
 tam
 maññante Kālidāsam kavijanahadayānandahetuñ kavitte
 sāyam lokatthasiddhim vitaratu racanā tassa Sāriñutassa.
 [12]⁹³

Canberra

Primoz Pecenko

⁹⁰Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 235 reads *rati vaddhati*.

⁹¹Ibid., reads *-ketunā*.

⁹²Ibid., reads *cānde*.

⁹³According to A.P. Buddhadatta this verse was written by one of Sāriputta's disciples, see *Theravādī Bauddhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoda: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), p. 79.

An Index to JPTS Volumes IX-XXII.

An Index to The Journals of the Pāli Text Society (1882-1927 = Volumes I-VIII), compiled by P.D.Ratnatunga (Mudaliyar) and revised with Appendix and arranged by S.S.Davidson, was published by the Society in 1973. This index lists, by author, the articles published in the Journals since it was revived in 1981. The years of publication are: IX (1981), X (1985), XI (1987), XII (1988), XIII (1989), XIV (1990), XV (1990), XVI (1992), XVII (1992), XVIII (1993), XIX (1993), XX (1994), XXI (1995), XXII (1996).

Bangchang, Supaphan na: A Pāli letter sent by the Aggamahāsenāpati of Siam to the royal court at Kandy in 1756	XII.185-212
Bureau, André: The Theravādins and East India according to the canonical texts	IX.1-9
Bechert, Heinz: The Bauddhayāna of Indonesia: A syncretistic form of Theravāda	IX.10-21
Buddhadatta, Aggamahāpāṇḍita Polvatte: <i>Paramatthavinicchaya</i> by Anuruddha	XI.155-226
Collins, Steven: <i>Kalyāṇamitta</i> and <i>Kalyāṇamittatā</i>	XI.51-72
Collins, Steven: On the very idea of the Pāli canon	XV.89-126
Collins, Steven: The story of the Elder Māleyyadeva	XVIII.65-96
Collins, Steven: see Denis, Eugène	
Cone, Mary: Patna <i>Dharmapada</i> . Part I: Text	XIII.101-217
Cone, Mary: The I.B.Horner Lecture 1995: Lexicography, Pāli and Pāli lexicography	XXII.1-34
Cousins, Lance S.: The <i>Patthāna</i> and the development of the Theravādin Abhidhamma	IX.22-46

Denis, Eugène and Steven Collins: <i>Brah Māleyyadevatthera-vatthu</i>	XVIII.1-64
Exell, R.H.B: <i>Rūpārūpavibhāga</i> by Buddhadatta	XVI.1-12
Filliozat, Jacqueline: Documents useful for the identification of Pāli manuscripts of Cambodia, Laos and Thailand	XVI.13-54
Filliozat, Jacqueline: A survey of Burmese and Siamese Pāli manuscript collections in the Wellcome Institute	XIX.1-41
Filliozat, Jacqueline: The commentaries to the <i>Anāgata- vamsa</i> in the Pāli manuscripts of the Paris collections	XIX.43-63
Filliozat, Jacqueline: Catalogue of the Pāli manuscript collections in Burmese and Siamese characters kept in the library of Vijayasundaramaya Asgiriya	XXI.135-191
Gombrich, Richard F.: A new Theravādin liturgy	IX.47-73
Gombrich, Richard F.: Old bodies like carts	XI.1-3
Gombrich, Richard F.: Three souls, one or none: the vagaries of a Pāli pericope	XI.73-78
Gombrich, Richard F.: Two notes on <i>Visuddhimagga</i> IX:1. The etymology of <i>puggala</i> ; 2. An imperfect form in Pāli	XII.169-171
Gombrich, Richard F.: A note on Ambapāli's wit	XV.139-140
Gombrich, Richard F.: Making mountains without molehills: the case of the missing stūpa	XV.141-143
Gombrich, Richard F.: Why is a <i>khattiya</i> called a <i>khattiya</i> ? The <i>Aggañña Sutta</i> revisited	XVII.213-214
Gombrich, Richard F.: The monk in the Pāli Vinaya: Priest or wedding guest?	XXI.193-213
Gombrich, Richard F.: Report of the Pāli Text Society for 1994	XXI.215-217

Hazlewood, Ann Appleby: A translation of <i>Pañcagatidīpanī</i>	XI.133-159
Hazlewood, Ann Appleby: <i>Saddhamopāyana</i> The gift offering of the true <i>Dhamma</i>	XII.65-168
Hallisey, Charles: <i>Tundilovāda</i> : an allegedly non- canonical <i>sutta</i>	XV.155-195
Hallisey, Charles: A propos the Pāli <i>Vinaya</i> as a historical document: a reply to Gregory Schopen	XV.197-208
Hallisey, Charles: <i>Nibbānasutta</i> : an allegedly non- canonical <i>sutta</i> on <i>nibbāna</i> as a great city	XVIII.97-130
Hinüber, Oskar von: The ghost word <i>dvīhitika</i> and the description of famines in early Buddhist literature	IX.74-86
Hinüber, Oskar von: Two Jātaka manuscripts from the National Library in Bangkok	X.1-22
Hinüber, Oskar von: The oldest dated manuscript of the <i>Milindapañha</i>	XI.111-119
Hinüber, Oskar von: An additional note on the oldest dated manuscript of the <i>Milindapañha</i>	XII.173-174
Hinüber, Oskar von: Remarks on a list of books sent to Ceylon from Siam in the 18th century	XII.175-183
Hinüber, Oskar von: <i>Kandhakavatta</i> : Loss of text in the Pāli <i>Vinayapiṭaka</i> ?	XV.127-138
Hinüber, Oskar von: The arising of an offence: <i>āpattisamuṭṭhāna</i>	XVI.55-69
Hinüber, Oskar von: The <i>Nigamanas</i> of the <i>Sumaṅgalavilāsini</i> and the <i>Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī</i>	XXI.129-133
Hinüber, Oskar von: Chips from Buddhist workshops. Scribes and manuscripts from Northern Thailand	XXII.35-57

Horner, Isaline Blew: <i>Keci</i> “some” in the Pāli commentaries	X.87-95
Hundius, Harald: The colophons of thirty Pāli manuscripts from Northern Thailand	XIV.1-173
Jackson, P.: A note on Dhammapāla(s)	XV.209-211
Jaini, Padmanabh S.: <i>Thīrthaṃkara-prakṛti</i> and the Bodhisattva path	IX.96-104
Jong, Jan Willem de: Fa-hsien and Buddhist texts in Ceylon	IX.105-115
Kahrs, Eivind G.: Exploring the Saddanīti	XVII.1-212
Kalupahana, D.J.: The philosophy of history in early Buddhism	IX.117-126
Khantipālo, Bhikkhu: Where's that <i>sutta</i> ? A guide to the discourses in the numerical collection (<i>Ānguttara-nikāya</i>)	X.37-153
Lamotte, Étienne: The <i>Gāravasutta</i> of the <i>Samyutta-nikāya</i> and its Mahāyānist developments	IX.127-144
Liyanaratne, Jinadasa: Pāli manuscripts of Sri Lanka in the Cambridge University Library	XVIII.131-147
Liyanaratne, Jinadasa: South Asian flora as reflected in the twelfth-century Pāli lexicon <i>Abhidhānappadipikā</i>	XX.43-161
Liyanaratne, Jinadasa: A Pāli canonical passage of importance for the history of Indian medicine	XXII.59-72
Lottermoser, Friedgard: Minor Pāli grammar texts: the <i>Saddabindu</i> and its “new” subcommentary	XI.79-109
Manné, Joy: Categories of <i>sutta</i> in the Pāli Nikāyas and their implications for our appreciation of the Buddhist teaching and literature	XV.29-87

Manné, Joy: Case histories from the Pāli canon I: The *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* hypothetical case history or how to be sure to win a debate XXI.1-34

Manné, Joy: Case histories from the Pāli canon II: *Sotāpanna, sakadāgāmin, anāgāmin, arahat* - the four stages case history or spiritual materialism and the need for tangible results XXI.35-128

Mellick Cutler, Sally: The Pāli *Apadāna* collection XX.1-42

Mills, Laurence C.R: The case of the murdered monks XVI.71-75

Mori, Sodo: *Uttaravihāraṭṭhakathā* and *Sārasamāsa* XII.1-47

Nihom, Max: *Kāmaloka*: a rare Pāli loan word in Old Javanese XX.163-170

Nolot, Édith: Studies in Vinaya technical terms I-III (1. *saṅgha-kamma*, 2. *adhikarāṇa*, 3. *mānattā, parivāsa, abbhāna*) XXII.73-150

Norman, Kenneth Roy: *Devas* and *adhidevas* in Buddhism IX.145-155

Norman, Kenneth Roy: Pāli lexicographical studies III: Ten Pāli etymologies X.23-36

Norman, Kenneth Roy: Pāli lexicographical studies IV: Eleven Pāli etymologies XI.33-49

Norman, Kenneth Roy: Pāli lexicographical studies V: Twelve Pāli etymologies XII.49-63

Norman, Kenneth Roy: Pāli lexicographical studies VI: Six Pāli etymologies XIII.219-227

Norman, Kenneth Roy: Pāli lexicographical studies VII: Five Pāli etymologies XIV.219-225

Norman, Kenneth Roy: Index to JPTS volumes IX-XIV XIV.227f.

Norman, Kenneth Roy: Pāli lexicographical studies VIII: Seven Pāli etymologies	XV.145-154
Norman, Kenneth Roy: Index to JPTS volumes IX-XV	XV.213-214
Norman, Kenneth Roy: Pāli lexicographical studies IX: Four Pāli etymologies	XVI.77-85
Norman, Kenneth Roy: Pāli lexicographical studies X: Two Pāli etymologies	XVII.215-218
Norman, Kenneth Roy: Pāli lexicographical studies XI: Six Pāli etymologies	XVIII.149-164
Norman, Kenneth Roy: Index to JPTS volumes IX-XVIII	XVIII.177-180
Norman, Kenneth Roy: External sandhi in Pāli (with special reference to the <i>Suttanipāta</i>)	XIX.203-213
Norman, Kenneth Roy: Pāli lexicographical studies XII: Ten Pāli etymologies	XX.211-230
Pind, Ole Holten: Studies in Pāli grammarians I: Buddhaghosa's references to grammar and grammarians	XIII.33-81
Pind, Ole Holten: Studies in Pāli grammarians II.1	XIV.175-218
Pruitt, William: Reference to Pāli in 17th-century French books	XI.119-131
Pruitt, William: Burmese manuscripts in the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.	XIII.1-31
Rahula, Walpola: Humour in Pāli literature	IX.156-174
Ruegg, David Seyfort: A further note on Pāli <i>gotrabhū</i>	IX.175-177
Saddhatissa, Hammalava: Pāli literature in Cambodia	IX.178-197
Saddhatissa, Hammalava: <i>Nāmarūpasamāso</i> : The summary of mind and matter	XI.5-31
Saddhatissa, Hammalava: <i>Nāmacāradīpikā</i>	XV.1-28

Schopen, Gregory: The *stūpa* cult and the extant Pāli Vinaya XIII.83-100

Schopen, Gregory: The ritual obligations and the donor roles of monks XVI.87-107

Skilling, Peter: The Raksā literature of the Śrāvakayāna XVI.109-182

Skilling, Peter: A citation from the **Buddhavāmsa* of the XVIII.165-175 Abhayagiri school

Skilling, Peter: Theravādin literature in Tibetan XIX.69-201 translation

Skilling, Peter: *Vimuttimagga* and Abhayagiri: the form-XX.171-210 aggregate according to the *Samskrṭāsamskrṭa-viniścaya*

Skilling, Peter: The *Sambuddhe* verses and later XXII.150-183 Theravāda Buddhology

Stargardt, Janice: The oldest known Pāli texts, 5th-6th century; results of the Cambridge symposium on the Pyu golden Pāli text from Śrī Kṣetra, 18-19 April XXI. 199-213 1995

Thiradhammo Bhikkhu: Corrections to *The Book of the Discipline* XIX.65-68

Warder, A.K.: Some problems of the later Pāli literature IX.198-207

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME

Professor Dr. O. v. Hinüber
Orientalisches Seminar
Albert-Ludwigs-Universität
D-79085 Freiburg i. Brsg.
Germany

Thomas Oberlies
Orientalisches Seminar
Albert-Ludwigs-Universität
D-79085 Freiburg i. Brsg.
Germany

Primoz Pecenko
South and West Asia Centre
Faculty of Asian Studies
A. N. U.
Canberra, ACT 0200
Australia

Hans Penth
Archive of Lan Na Inscriptions
Social Research Institute
Chiang Mai University
Chiang Mai 50200
Thailand

Peter Skilling
68/123 Prachanivet 4
Prachachun Road
T. Tasai, A. Muang, Nonthaburi
Thailand 11000

NOTICE FROM THE COUNCIL RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS IN PALI STUDIES

The Council of the Pali Text Society invite applications for research Fellowships from suitably qualified persons, working in the field of Pali studies. Applicants will usually be in the fourth year of a course of graduate research, or its equivalent. The course of research will be expected to lead to publishable material, on the publication rights of which the Pali Text Society will have first option.

Fellowships will be tenable for one year in the first instance, with a possibility of renewal. When fixing the value, account will be taken of the appropriate level for a comparable research worker in the applicant's country of domicile. Letters of application and requests for information should be sent to:

The President,
Pali Text Society,
73 Lime Walk,
Headington,
Oxford OX3 7AD.

EDITORIAL NOTICE

The Council of the Pali Text Society plan to continue publication of the *Journal* on an *ad hoc* basis, as and when sufficient material of a publishable standard is received.

The *Journal* will publish short Pali texts, translations, and commentaries on texts, catalogues and handlists of Pali books and manuscripts, and similar material.

Papers should be sent to the President, at the above address.

To reduce printing costs, contributors are urged, whenever possible, to present their papers in a camera-ready copy form.